3 1761 05238598 6

Presented to

The Library

of the

University of Toronto

by

Mrs. D. J. Snider

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/europeanhistoryc00sniduoft

THE NEW SYSTEM OF THOUGHT

Which Dr. Snider has been engaged upon for some years, embraces the following works:

I. THE PSYCHOLOGY

1. Intellect — Psychology and Psychosis . . $1.50
2. The Will and its World $1.50
3. Feeling, with Prolegomena $1.50

II. HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

1. Ancient European Philosophy $1.50
2. Modern European Philosophy $1.50

III. INSTITUTIONS

1. Social Institutions $1.50
2. The State $1.50

IV. ÆSTHETIC

1. Architecture $1.50
2. Music (in preparation) $1.50
3. World's Fair Studies $1.50

V. HISTORY

1. The American Ten Years' War $1.50
2. The Father of History (Herodotus) . . . $1.50
3. European History $1.50

The plan has also in view a psychological treatment of Biography and of Nature.

EUROPEAN HISTORY

CHIEFLY ANCIENT

IN ITS PROCESSES

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

BY

DENTON J. SNIDER

153362
26 | 11 | 19

ST. LOUIS, MO.
SIGMA PUBLISHING CO.
310 PINE ST.

(For sale by A. C. M'Clurg & Co., Booksellers, Chicago, Ills.)

Copyright by D. J. Snider, 1908

Nixon-Jones Printing Co., 215 Fine Street, St. Louis

CONTENTS

Introduction	5-148
Sect. First—Elements	9- 40
" Second—The State Universal	41- 73
" Third—Circummigration	74-105
" Fourth—Periodicity	106-132
" Fifth—Outlook	133-148
Ancient European History	149-190
Hellas	191-235
Early Hellas	236-254
Autonomous Hellas	255-328
Macedonian Hellas	329-390

ROME—INTRODUCTION 391-436

ROME ASSOCIATES HERSELF . . . 437-439
(1) COMMUNAL ASSOCIATION . . . 439-454
(2) CIVIC ASSOCIATION 454-477
(3) ETHNIC ASSOCIATION 477-494

ROME ASSOCIATES THE WORLD . . . 495-504
(1) ITALY ASSOCIATED 504-517
(2) ASSOCIATION ASSAILED . . . 517-533
(2) MEDITERRANEAN ASSOCIATION . 533-550

THE WORLD ASSOCIATES ROME . . . 550-558
(1) ITALIC ASSOCIATION 558-589
(2) PROVINCIAL ASSOCIATION . . 589-608
(3) THE WORLD'S ASSOCIATION . . 608-625

EMPIRE—INTRODUCTION 626-642
ASSOCIATION IMPARTED 643-651
ASSOCIATION DISSOCIATED 651-661
ASSOCIATION RESTORED 661-668

THE MIDDLE AGES 669-676
THE MODERN TIME 677-691

EUROPEAN HISTORY.

Introduction.

A keen and learned observer of historic events has declared that European History as recorded is a chaos. The expression is too sweeping, though it contains a good deal of truth. Europe in its career through time has certainly thrown off more History than any other continental division of the globe. All have to go to Europe for the study of the rise and evolution of History and of the historic consciousness. A leading question in this department of human knowledge would seem to be: How shall this more or less unorganized mass of events be put into some kind of order? The purpose must now be not to dig up old sunken occurrences, which are

already overwhelming in their quantity and confusion, but to find and to set forth the inner process of History, both in large and in little. There is a growing dissatisfaction with the current specializing tendency of historic study as one-sided, as giving in all its details no fundamental knowledge of the subject. The present is an attempt to run some fresh lines of organization in the vast material of History alongside of those which already exist.

But is it possible to find any sort of framework into which we can put the long and varied historic development of Europe? We speak of European Mind, of European Art, Literature and Philosophy; there must be a European Consciousness, or perchance a European Folk-Soul distinct from the Oriental on the one hand and the American on the other. Can this be formulated or be made over into terms of thought whereby the thinking man can know it and employ it for his purpose? Europe's huge pile of historic facts must have an order. In the diversified multitude of its political occurrences we have to seek its central principle, its unity, and express the same in words which make it present and conscious to the human mind.

The history of Europe has been chiefly written by Europeans who have been inside its movement; an advantage comes from this situation

and also a disadvantage. The European historian necessarily partakes of the unconscious European mind; he is not the best person to bring it out of such a state and to make it conscious. An outsider is better situated for seeing the totality than the one who is inside.

It is also to be noted that an American or an Oriental will each view Europe in his own way, and both ways will be different from that of the native European. Each must interpret a foreign institutional world through his own. The same outline of facts will not only have different meanings, but also be organized differently by each. It needs but little intercourse with the Oriental mind to come upon its basic belief that the rest of the world springing from Asia is an emanation from the central sun of the East, and really a falling-off, a lapse from the original creative source. That indeed has been the main tenet of the religions of the East amid all their diversities. On the other hand it requires not much acquaintance with the American mind to discover that its conviction is the opposite: it believes in evolution rather than emanation, in the rise of man more than the fall. Now people of these diverse mental attitudes will certainly look at the History of Europe, the intermediate and indeed mediating continent, each after his own character and limitations.

Then again the European Historian belongs to

some part of Europe, to some one of its nationalities. The result is that a true and complete survey of total Europe will be apt to receive from him a national and even a local twist. The History of the Byzantine Empire, for instance, is handed down to us through West-European Historians, religous and secular; we have received in consequence a very prejudiced and inadequate account of the vast service rendered to Europe for more than a thousand years by Byzantium. The judgment of an English historian concerning France, and a French Historian's opinion of England will have to be revised by the impartial extra-European.

With the change of viewpoint will come a deeper change: historic method and historic perspective, in general the way of treating History will be considerably altered. We seek for its movement in the whole and in detail; a mere narrative of events is not enough; if it be artistic and interesting, it will keep its place, yet it should be overarched by something greater. The inner process of History has to be found, developed, formulated; moreover such a process must be ultimately that of man creating it, of his Self. So all the processes of History in their final form will be psychical.

Section First.

Elemental.

In unfolding European History, there are certain primary matters or facts which we may well call elemental, being the given or presumed elements of it from which a start is made, and which are necessarily set forth in a more or less discursive manner, by way of introduction. We find from the beginning a spatial and a temporal element in History; another fundamental fact is the State, the political element, whose development furnishes the basic content of the historic process. The development of the State, however, reaches back to racial differences and their origin, insofar as the latter is ascertainable. A cursory treatment of these elements is the first step in our task.

I.

History has first of all, to be localized, to be put within its spatial limits, which in the present case are those of Europe. Moreover such a locality or territory has its physical conformation which is the outer setting for its devolpment, and contributes to the character of its inhabitants. Still further, History will be seen moving in the

succesion of time through a line of localities from its small beginning till it makes the circuit of Europe and embraces the whole European territory.

The first observation to be noted under the present head is that Europe is *peninsular*. This physical fact makes its shape individual and unique when compared with any other grand division of the globe.

If we look at Europe moving out of the vastness and territorial massiveness of Asia, it runs to a point in its totality and in its parts. Glance at its map: as a whole it is largely surrounded by water, and many of its leading divisions have the same physical characteristic. We may therefore say that in its unity as well as in its multiplicity Europe in peninsular. The impress of the whole is stamped upon each of its parts, in the main; the territorial entirety seems to have created in its own image each particular country. Africa just across the Mediterranean is quite the opposite in this regard; it seems to shun the peninsula, even if a few of them may be pointed out. Its shape is that of a compact solidified, undifferentiated mass; it offers no series of handles to a starting civilization; the entirety must be seized, or none at all. Still one small isolated corner did offer a special opportunity to the slowly evolving man, and Egypt became the seedfield of primitive culture Asia,

the largest of the grand divisions of the globe, may be regarded from the present point of view as combining Africa and Europe, as having the massiveness of the one and somewhat of the peninsular diversity of the other.

The basic physical fact of Europe is then peninsular, a fact which we shall see to be harmonious with and indeed suggestive of its spiritual character. Not that this or any other physical fact made the people of Europe, though it influenced them; nature does not make man, nor man nature, though both are made for each other and find each other—both being parts or stages of a greater process than either taken by itself.

The movement of European History opens in the little Greek peninsula, smallest of the three North-Mediterranean peninsulas. It is subdivided into many lesser peninsulas, so that it repeats total Europe in its small and smallest shapes, and thus it may be said to mirror or fore-token the great European totality. Moreover the Greek peninsula proper has shown the power of growing larger and larger, till it seems to be made up of three peninsulas one on top of the other, so that in our day the whole is known by the name of the Balkan peninsula. Nor should we forget that Greece is quite as much insular as peninsular, having a great multitude of islands clustering around it or rather in the

heart of it. Here again the physical appearance strikingly pre-figures the institutional world with its communities more or less isolated — each seeking to be a little island in itself. Greek life we shall find to be decidedly insular and peninsular.

From Greece the stress of History passes to Rome and the Italic peninsula, the latter having its own distinctive character, and becoming the seat of the imperial idea in Europe. Through Rome civilization rises to being Mediterranean, engirdling entirely the great inland sea which interconnects Europe, Asia and Africa. The third peninsula, the Spanish, after the decline of Rome, becomes possessed of a unique culture in the time of the Moors, which reaches quite through the medieval period.

Next the fact meets us that the spirit governing civilization moves out of the Mediterranean peninsulas, and turns Oceanic, taking up its abode in the Atlantic States of the North, which are not so decidedly peninsular. This transition is the work of the period known as the Renascence. At the same time there is a prodigious expansion outwards over the Ocean, which, owing to improved navigation, is no longer a barrier to Europe. America is discovered and the Cape of Good Hope is rounded. Moreover the chief insular people of total Europe inhabiting the one large European island, Great Britain, develops

into a nation and takes its place in the society of European nations.

But in this topographical movement of History we have come to its last sweep. It turns eastward and reaches a new peninsula, the Scandinavian. Its final act is the founding of two great States in north-eastern Europe, Prussia and Russia, whose main development lies in the past two centuries—the eighteenth and nineteenth.

Such is the spatial cycle through which the movement of the civilized European State passes, starting in ancient Greece with its smallest or atomic form and unfolding into its largest expanse in the Russian Empire. The time of this movement has lasted some 2500 years, during which European Civilization, pressing westward to the Atlantic, then wheeling northward and eastward, has encircled its entire territory. Limit after limit we see it placing upon itself, and then bursting over these limits one beyond the other till the limit of Europe itself has been definitely reached and recognized. Europe must now break out of Europe, if it be true to its character as limit-transcending, which it has shown through the ages. This it has been slowly doing for some centuries, but the grand, sudden outburst took place in the last third of the Nineteenth Century when Europe overflowed into Africa and partitioned

this Continent among its leading States. Thus Europe having completed its territorial cycle within itself, seems to be pouring over its limits on all sides.

European History in its successive epochs down to the present will of necessity follow on the lines of the foregoing geographical cycle, coming back in the last land and interlinking with the first. Thus Europe manifests a return upon itself in Space, in the outermost elemental form of Nature, which is the setting of its History.

II.

Having marked out the spatial limits of the historic movement of Europe, we may next glance at the other elemental frame-work of its History, namely, Time. The temporal succession of events and epochs is involved in the preceding territorial succession of European States; in the mentioned geographical round lurks also a chronological round, to which a few words can be given here at the start.

The circuit of Europe in Space is, therefore, accomplished in Time, and this Time is measured by years or by the circuit of the total Earth around the Sun. Man, when he gets to be historic, picks up this cosmical measurer and uses the same to measure off his own cycles of activity and development, that he may know not

only what he has done but how rapid has been his progress. He asks and must ask, how many such annual circuits have been required for him to make the foregoing spatial round of Europe. Thus enters a chronological element into History, suggesting from Nature herself its cyclical character or its periodicity. That is, the historic Time-measurer is itself a self-returning circuit of a year or a day perchance, and by its own inherent necessity will measure off the total movement of History in circuits or periods. To be sure Time does not stop, but moves on after completing its lesser and greater historic rounds, for these, even the largest, are still some particular manifestation of the universal end of History, toward which they are evolving.

Chronology is, then, the temporal setting of History, its movement in Time through Space, or its movement in successive periods through successive territories, till not only Europe but the whole globe be taken up in its sweep. Of course we are at present dealing merely with Europe, which has certainly been more prolific of History than any other part of the globe. Such, however, is the first ordering of historic events whose chronology reveals their outer succession, and suggests their inner evolution. We feel bound to inquire into the connection between what goes before and what comes after, yea, between the first stage of a great historic cycle

and the last. Chronology measures the steps of man as he moves out of barbarism into civilization, ordering for him the original chaos of Time into days, years and centuries. Thus he can truly know and organize for his thought what he has passed through, while he also begins to become conscious of the end toward which he is going.

At this point another question has surely arisen: What fills and moves in this spatial and temporal cycle of European History just now marked out? Space and Time are of themselves rather empty and indeed very elusive; they are pure elemental forms into which man and his actions are set, forms not to be neglected indeed but to be filled with a content, here the content of History. A line of particular States we behold rounding itself out in a long evolution; this fact in its simplest, most primary form we shall look at next.

III.

Having thus given the outer, territorial round of European History from its temporal beginning down to the present, we shall now call attention to a much deeper, though parallel fact. Looking at the Europe of to-day, we observe that it is a collection or group of many separate States. Looking at the start of History in ancient Greece we observe that the latter is chiefly a collection

or group of many separate Cities, which are likewise States. The similarity in this respect between the opening and (for us) the close of European History is striking. Undoubtedly there are great differences lying between these two similar historic extremes, which differences are not to be left out of account in our complete survey. But summarily viewing here and now the History of Europe unfolding before us, we can affirm that it begins and ends in a *Polyarchy*, a multitude of independent autonomous States. Such is the word which specially designates a fact fundamental to our subject, and which we shall be compelled often to employ.

Again Europe can be seen in a very significant aspect of its history circling back as it were to its starting point, and forming a rounded-off totality. If such be the similarity between then and now, we should also take note of some of the differences. That ancient Greek world was essentially composed of small autonomous communities, which may be called City-States; modern Europe is essentially composed of autonomous nations large and small, which may be called Nation-States. Here a very important distinction is seen interjecting itself between ancient and modern forms of government—that of the City-State and the Nation-State. This distinction declares that nationality has unfolded and institutionalized itself in modern Europe—

something which ancient Hellas could not do. Undoubtedly the old Greeks formed one people essentially homogeneous, but they showed themselves wholly unable to unite into a common political institution, and thus make a Nation-State. In fact a long, long discipline of Europe, lasting quite twenty centuries, lies between these two governmental forms, whose evolution overarches European History. The State is the association of man for winning and preserving his Will, his free activity, and it keeps widening out more and more toward universality. We may conceive that little point of a community, the City-State of Greece, expanding and evolving till there arises Europe with its totality of Nation-States. Now History as political has to deal fundamentally with the State, and to record its mutation and development in and through the events of time. Accordingly we must keep our eye upon the movement of the political institution, the State, in our large historic sweeps which take up beginning and end.

European History, then, as recorded, moves between two Polyarchies, the ancient and the modern, the first and the last—the old Greek Polyarchy of City-States and the present European Polyarchy of Nation-States. (Recollect that we use the somewhat unfamiliar word *Polyarchy* not in the sense of *the government of the many*, but in the sense of *many governments*

separate and independent, yet clustered in a group or system.)

It is evident from the foregoing that Europe has revealed in her History a dominant separative tendency. Her political character has on the whole resisted unity; she has shown herself averse to consolidation, at least on a large scale. At present Europe decidedly refuses to form a political Whole, quite as old Greece refused to form a national Whole. The ground is that the European mind generally fears the Great State as endangering freedom. This can only mean that the European mind has not yet reached the point at which it feels able to construct the total European State as the safeguard of liberty more adequate than present Europe can be in its divided, self-repellent condition. If association mean in its very nature the association of all ultimately, and if the end of History be the bringing forth of the universal State, as the final security of freedom, then Europe has not arrived at the goal, even though facing thitherwards. Looking at her from afar across the water with sympathy and hope, we cannot help thinking that the first political problem of Europe is to build one State out of her many parts, and thus get rid of armaments along with the greater burden of national fears and hates.

But coming back to our previous declaration, we may repeat that European History begins and

ends in a group or society of autonomous Commonwealths, after having passed through other governmental forms. Thus it suggests a political cycle running from ancient Greece to the Europe of our time, or as before said from the old to the new Polyarchy. Each too has shown a similar limitation—the first being unable to form a national, the second an international State.

IV.

And now having duly noted the strongly separative character of European consciousness in its historic manifestation, we should turn to the opposite tendency and mark that as a part and counterpart in the great European totality of Commonwealths. We shall observe that Europe has not always been Polyarchic, but that a long and important stretch of its History has shown a decided movement toward unifying itself under one government. Rome both as Republic and as Empire possessed such a spirit. Particularly the Roman Empire organized and held together for hundreds of years the Mediterranean world not only in Europe, but also in Asia and Africa. This mighty influence, however, came of an European people and was distinctly the outgrowth of Europe in one of its native, deeply fermenting tendencies. It may be said, therefore, that the European Folk-Soul has shown a

bent, an aspiration underneath all its division toward a united State. This State as it has already existed in part, and as it has often tried to get itself realized, and as it is continually fermenting and at work, though largely unconscious, in the oceanic pulsations of European peoples, must be distinctly reckoned with in history and especially named. We shall call it the *Henarchy* in contrast with the Polyarchy and also in contrast with the Monarchy of Europe — the latter being many likewise, and of many kinds.

Rome, was, therefore, the realized Henarchy, or the most nearly realized one, in European History. Note that it lies between the two Polyarchies, ancient and modern, bridging them externally in Time and internally in Spirit. For that imperial character of Rome has not been lost, but has gone over into the modern Nation-State, making it imperial also, even in its separate existence. Each great European Nation-State of to-day has provinces, colonies and other dependencies, with central authority; thus we may call present Europe a Polyarchy of Empire Nation-States, almost wholly monarchical.

Cæsar can well be deemed, not the greatest conqueror perhaps, but the greatest political man or statesman whom Europe has hitherto produced, because he realized for his time and people, the Henarchy, which lies so deep and so strong, though unorganized and chaotic, in the

European Folk-Soul. Many great men since his age, mighty conquerors and organizers, have had the same purpose, heroic shapes such as Charlemagne and Napoleon: they have, however, reached the goal but imperfectly and very temporarily; the separative character of political Europe has been too strong even for their gigantic strength. The Polyarchy soon broke to pieces the Henarchy, partial as this was; witness the Allies overwhelming the Corsican Cæsar and vengefully redividing his Empire. Other less gifted rulers like Louis XIV and Charles V, have been possessed of the same Henarchic impulse and have produced their historic flurry, only to be completely foiled in their design by the far more powerful countervailing spirit. Modern Europe, then, persists at present in being a Polyarchy of Empire Nation-States, and that is its present political consciousness.

Still the opposite instinct or trend is present, lurking in many occurrences often called international. It is worth our while to pass a moment in probing to the sources of this unitary bent in the European Folk-Soul, once dominant and still breaking up fitfully and longingly to the surface of History. Penetrating backward to their origin, we find that European peoples, with some small exceptions, are of one race, the Aryan, though of many stocks and people and tribes.

The instinct of racial unity, accordingly, runs through them all. Moreover they speak substantially one tongue at the root, which radical tongue branches out into many diversities. Thus the instinct of a common speech, the chief means of communication between man and man, underlies their spoken words and their literature. Then Europe has adopted one religion in which it feels its unity more deeply than in any other way, even if this religion has split up into many divisions which have brought in their train conflict, war and hate. In fact we can observe a kind of unity of institutions (often faint enough) particularly of the political institution, in the primitive peoples of Europe, which they are generally supposed to have brought with them from their old Aryan habitations in Asia. Of course Turkey is the exception to all these unities.

In such fashion we grope far back among the origins of European peoples and find there a remarkable oneness in race, speech, institutions, and more recently in religion. Such we may rightly deem to be the primal deep-seated source of that unitary spirit, that Henarchic bent, which, though suppressed to-day and unrealized, is profoundly present and active in the undercurrents of European consciousness, and will yet have something to say in the formation of the coming Great State. Europe is essentially uniracial, unilingual, unireligious and primordially

unipolitical, though all these units have been separated into many diversities by the separative partitioning spirit which is also European.

It may be asked which of these two tendencies is the stronger and destined ultimately to prevail? The answer must be in general that both have to be preserved, neither can be permanently destroyed or even suppressed. Both the unitary and the separative elements belong to the complete movement of the State, for they belong to the complete man. Both are necessary stages of the one psychical process of the Self for which and out of which the State and all Institutions spring. Now of this psychical process (Psychosis) European History is one great manifestation and bears the impress of it through and through, being organized by it in the great whole and in the details. The vast historic cycle as well as the little epoch have thus a common soul, and are veritably psychical, revealing in their proper presentation an universal principle of order.

The one government or rule (Henarchy) in Europe has had, then, its historic manifestation; but it nestles most deeply as an instinct in the European Folk-Soul, which has by no means yet realized itself politically. The trend, however, we can see. Out of its original Aryan protoplasm of peoples and institutions Europe has evolved its present strong bent toward national unity, which has been most strikingly manifested in the

recent unification of the German and Italian nations. The same spirit is at work trying to nationalize the fragments of peoples scattered over the Balkan peninsula. If we compare this latest tendency with that of the old Greek City-State we may catch a glimpse of Europe's whitherwards.

We should note, then, the strong inner dualism of Europe as political, which in our terms is that between Polyarchy and Henarchy. The divisive, Polyarchic spirit is what prevails today, as a look at the map shows. Still there is many a sign of the underlying Henarchic impulse toward unity; this is indeed Europe's aspiration for the grand end of History. It is true that the struggle between these two principles has rent historic Europe from the beginning, and they are still fighting each other instead of being reconciled and preserved in a political order higher than either in its one-sidedness, yet embracing both. European reality is the Polyarchy, European aspiration is the Henarchy. It is in the latter that the new political synthesis is darkly working, and faintly foreshadowing the supreme end of Europe's History and indeed of all History in the State universal.

V.

Underlying the divisive character of European History we have just seen the unitary substrate,

which is largely pre-historic. The one race, the one tongue, the one set of primitive institutions reach back beyond the ken of History proper, though it presupposes them and builds on them as foundation. The one religion of Europe we are not to forget, is of historic origin, having passed from its civilized to its uncivilized peoples. The Ottoman is a present exception to this unity, or we may say to these unities of European consciousness. And the thought of Turkey, the intruder, leads us to note the deepest dualism in European History, namely that between Europe and the Orient, or more precisely between Europe and West-Asia, including the Valley of the Nile. Thus we are whirled downward and also backward to a separation more profound and searching than even the Polyarchic, which lies inside of Europe and is essentially historic, while the separation before us reaches deep into the racial abysses of the oldest prehistoric Orient.

As a matter of fact the History of Europe from its start till to-day has been bound up with that of West-Asia in a ceaseless round of action and reaction. Ancient Persia assailed Greece, and Alexander turned back upon Persia. And so the struggle has been going on ever since with alternating victory and defeat for both sides, whereby, however, the chief periodic sweeps or cycles of European History have been marked out, as will be seen later.

To the ground of this separation also can we not penetrate? Let us see. West-Asia has different races, in fact three fundamental races, Turanian, Semitic, and Aryan. To this racial difference is to be added the difference of religions, not merely of sects. The leading tongues of West-Asia differ in their roots and organic structure, and are not variations on the same set of roots as is mainly the case in Europe. Institutions are diverse, particularly the primal institution, the Family, which in West Asia is polygamous. The Oriental State likewise does not comport well with the European political spirit. Is it not evident that West-Asia is split to pieces in those basic elements in which Europe is united? Summing up the contrast we may put it thus: West-Asia is multiracial, multilingual, and multireligious, while Europe is uniracial, unilingual and unireligious.

Such, then, is the deep separation, parent of the greatest historic conflicts of the ages. The Ottomans, a West-Asiatic people, wedging themselves into Europe which differs from them in race, language and religion, as well as in institutions, have succeeded in producing just about the shrillest discord in the World's History, rasping not only the nerves of Europe but even of America.

Still the twain belong together and cannot part; we may deem them the Siamese twins of

History trouncing each other mercilessly, and yet inseparable, yea, necessary to each other's historic existence, if we are to judge by the past. Each has something which the other secretly sighs after, and in fact needs for its welfare. West-Asia precipitating itself upon Europe, is seeking, even if blindly and externally, to get Europe's boon. On the other hand Europe overflowing into the Orient, may be regarded as a kind of missionary, even if with a keen eye to her own profit; seemingly she feels cooped up in her narrow bounds and will impart her civilization to other races, perchance will start to building the multiracial State, not like the Asiatic despotism but constitutionalized after the European pattern, with its precious gift of ever-increasing freedom. One thing seems certain: the civilization of Europe, hitherto uniracial, must rise to being multiracial, if it is to keep its place in the world-historical movement of the total globe now clearly setting in.

Here, however, we wish to emphasize a matter which will be often brought up again, the profound separation and struggle between Europe and West-Asia, fundamental in European History. From old Xerxes down till to-day the seesaw between these two divisions of the globe has been kept up, with the result of generating the ultimate periodic movements of the one great historic totality embracing European civilization.

These of course, are to be more fully indicated, hereafter; but at present we must be content simply to touch upon that original separation of lands and peoples which is the birth-point of our theme.

A glance forward may here be taken in order to avoid misapprehension. It might seem from the foregoing that Europe has the historic unity, and West-Asia the multiplicity. Politically we shall find just the opposite to be the case. Europe will show a great diversity of particular States, which we have already called the Polyarchy, while West-Asia will show a tendency to one supreme State or Empire which subordinates its diversities of races, religions and institutions. Indeed it is just this political difference which we shall see determining their History.

VI.

Repeatedly in the preceding account there has been mentioned the Aryan migration from Asia into Europe, whose surface has been almost covered by the great overflow of peoples of the one race. Far back, then, the Aryans must be considered as intruders upon European soil, as well as the more recent Arabs and Turks. From the beginning Europe has been deemed the prize of the East, and has requited the feeling. But the fact now to be dwelt upon is that Asia is

originally the parent and Europe is the child. That is, Europe is a *derived world* physically and also mentally, showing its derivation in race, speech, religion and institutions. It is not the starting-point of itself, it contains not its own germ, it is not its own original, at least not primordially.

Most significant is the fact that the language (or languages) which Europe speaks, the very means of its own inter-communication and culture, comes from outside. The roots of its speech reach back to Asia, the old continent of sources; the German and the Frenchman, in fact all Europe with two or three slight exceptions utter the same radical sounds to express thought and feeling, that the ancient Persian and Hindoo employed. With speech came also early institutions, particularly the Village Community, which has been recently traced among primitive peoples both in Europe and Asia. Undoubtedly from these roots has sprung a great diversity of European tongues; but their original unity in a distant home has been shown by science in one of her greatest triumphs during the Nineteenth Century.

The historic peoples of Europe are immigrants, we might say foreigners, having come from an outside land and supplanted the native pre-historic race, some of whose relics are still found in certain localities. The dominant

Aryan stock flowed westward out of Central Asia in a series of migrations which we may still discern vaguely and arrange in successive layers by the affinities of their speech, as Celtic, Italic, Hellenic, Teutonic and Slavic. These derived peoples, of Oriental origin are now the owners and rulers of all Europe, and have been for several thousands of years. They have indeed made its history, having been engaged quite up to date in fighting one another. Each in succession has attained supremacy for a time, and then has been pushed to the wall by a new branch of some Aryan stock. Europe thus has been the historic arena of these Asiatic immigrants, or if you choose, intruders, elbowing and upheaving one another in a restless rise and fall of nations.

It is true that some investigators have sought to prove the European origin of these Aryan stocks, thus making Europe not derived but self-originating. But such a view contradicts tradition, speech, the order of human evolution from east to west, yea the course of the Sun himself, whose light man, and especially the Aryan man, has followed and worshiped as divine.

Far down in the depths of the European Folk-Soul lies the feeling of derivation from the Orient. This feeling often breaks up to the surface in the intense desire and uncontrollable impulse to get back to the fountain of its being,

to return to the primordial creative sources of itself for a quickening draught. Hence through all the History of Europe are periods when it faces about from its westward career and turns to the Orient as if to start over from the beginning. Particularly has religious Europe shown such an inner longing, since its faith springs directly from the Orient and is always striving to get back whence it is derived, and there drink afresh of its own original well-head. The same instinct is shown by Europe in the field of Comparative Philology, which carries us back to our Aryan cradle, seemingly in the Asiatic Highlands. Nor has the European political world been devoid of the same tendency.

Thus Europe in its very birth is twofold, turning to the West, the new, the unknown, and then returning to the East, the old, the known. Janus-faced it has to be, with look toward the future and toward the past, rounding out its time into cycles, dividing up its History into movements both progressive and regressive. It is, as already said, the derived, but this is only the half of it; the derived must show itself as original and thus become whole; derivation being only a part, seeks its own perfection by getting back to origination, thereby completing its process. Not without deep significance does European legend so often take as its hero the man who is mightily bent on finding his origin. And

the hero of science in the Nineteenth Century devotes himself to the same grand quest — to the origin of his species and so of himself.

From the foregoing view it will be inferred that the movement of European History in its deepest turns will be connected with the Orient. Europe involves Asia, at least Western Asia, and they both involve each other directly. Each has undoubtedly its own special History, but the truly universal History of each reveals their historic interaction, their mutual process, of which each is a member. The lesser cycles of European History must, accordingly, show their own incompleteness taken by themselves, and at the same time must show how they are made complete. Greece, the first in line, may be said to have been born in and through an Oriental invasion, which act is truly the genetic act of the succeeding great periods, or the large cycles, of European History. This fact will again come to notice when we are ready to divide organically, or to periodize the occurrences of Europe's time.

Hitherto this feeling of derivation in Europe has hardly been conscious, but rather an inherited instinct which has expressed itself in the uncertain forms of legend and tradition. Naturally the infant remembers nothing of its natal and prenatal period. But a new science, Comparative Philology, in the Nineteenth Century has made us aware of our Asiatic origin by the freshly un-

earthed document of human speech, in whose structure and varieties we can trace many grades and migrations of our pre-historic ancestors. Strange is the fact that we know far better the kinship between the Greek and the Persian in tongue and in blood than they themselves did when they were fighting each other at Marathon 2400 years ago. Speech has thus acquired a new meaning, never mentioned or mentionable by itself in its transmitted writing or in tradition; it speaks to us in a new way, in a speech of speech, and has actually enabled us to hear our hoary progenitors talking to each other somewhere in the Highlands of Asia, and also telling us a good deal about their life, their institutions, their religion. The old Aryan ancestor, like a ghost conjured up by spiritism, communicates with his remote descendants who dwell in lands of which he could not even dream, and who, after circling the globe in their migration westward, seem on the point of coming back historically to the first ancestral seats by way of the East. That would be indeed the complete return, the fulfilled though not ended cycle of Universal History, of which the whole European period would be but a link, the lesser cycle as part and pre-figurement of the greater.

The formation of language is a social, not an individual act merely. Its structure, once rightly seen into, will reveal the structure of the society

which formed it and transformed it. Such is the significant linguistic fact of our time; speech has turned back upon itself and told of itself in its own evolution along with that of the peoples speaking it. Primarily language transmitted the past orally in legend and tradition—a very uncertain and perishable way. Later it reached the point of handing down events in writing and preserved the worthy human deed in a permanent written record. But now the primal implement itself, both of speech and writ, is exhumed and examined, and is found to contain a unique message from those who used it and made it—a message long antecedent to anything directly transmitted by tradition or history proper, and which our century has been able to decipher, though not yet completely to read. Speech has become as it were self-conscious, turning back upon itself from its contents to its own formative process, in correspondence with the psychical act of human Self.

We are, accordingly, led to ask, What is the element of European History which language, taken by itself, supplies? It may be said to give a history of the pre-historic, or what has been hitherto deemed the pre-historic; it tells of those who have not told of themselves directly, yet who have brought forth the recorded ages, bearing the grand historic potentiality of Europe in themselves The decipherment of its

original language has raised to light the original protoplasm of Aryan peoples underlying and indeed generating and even regenerating again and again European civilization

VII.

Having now ascertained that Europe is derived from Asia and that European History is essentially a product of an emigrated Asiatic race, we may inquire into the form of this derivation, the character in which it first appeared. A mass of peoples, tribes, living waves of humanity beat upon the Eastern borders of Europe, having started from their Oriental homes, and effect a passage into the new world. It is not a single act, but billow after billow rolls forward during uncounted generations till at last the whole surface of Europe is covered practically by these immigrants who are of the Aryan race. They found other peoples of a different race occupying the land; these, however, were destroyed or absorbed except in a few remote corners. Such is the material which European History presupposes, and out of which it has sprung. This material has lasted quite down to the present time and is a prime element in the historic evolution of Europe. We need a name for it and so we shall call it the *Ethnic Protoplasm*, from which European civilization has been chiefly formed.

One of the several races of Asia has thus crossed over into Europe, bringing with it those elemental unities already set forth — racial, linguistic and institutional. This is the given material, the primitive stuff, unformed but formable, which History is to work over and transform into its varying manifestations in Time. A mighty artificer seems to be moulding these huge human masses into shapes which bear his design; a sculptor like Zeus himself rises up before us hewing the rude block of native marble into a long gallery of statues which reach from the beginning down to the present. This peculiar artificer shaping the World's History often out of this Ethnic Protoplasm we shall have to glance at; generally we shall designate him as the World-Spirit, a very important character or conception in our historic presentation, showing himself particularly in the pivotal crises of nations, and almost seeming to put out his mighty hand for helping supreme events into existence at the grand nodes of History.

Two things we have here accepted as given or taken for granted in unfolding European History: the Ethnic Protoplasm and the World-Spirit. The inquiring reader may well ask at this point: Whence do they come or who made them? The protoplasmic mass of peoples came from Asia, as already said; but how did it get to be in Asia? These questions are legitimate,

but will have to be deferred for the present. Just now the point is to grasp these two given primordial elements of European History and to see their respective functions.

Once upon a time, then, before the historic dawn, Europe was overlaid with a mass of barbarous peoples, constituting just this Ethnic Protoplasm. With Greece a division in it began to take place; small dots rose out of the barbaric sea and began to give forth a peculiar new light called civilization in a general way. From then onward the process has been to civilize this entire Ethnic Protoplasm, which becomes less and less in quantity till at present in Europe it is about exhausted. The record of this process constitutes European History, which is from this point of view the transformation of the uncivilized Ethnic Protoplasm spread over Europe from Asia, into the civilized Polyarchy of imperial Nation-States, which is the Europe of today.

It is manifest that a line of division is drawn through European History between the civilized and uncivilized peoples, both of the same race, yet each struggling with and re-acting upon the other. Each has its particular function in History. That special Aryan branch or stock which reaches and fulfils a certain stage of civilization, and then declines, is sent by History to take a fresh dip into this primitive Ethnic Protoplasm for a renewal and another advance of civilization.

The Macedonian and Roman and Teutonic conquests were such baptisms of old and effete yet civilized States into their own original racial fountain-head. Modern Europe springs from the grand historic immersion of the aged and worn-out Mediterranean States of antiquity into the protoplasmic El Dorado which certainly renewed the European world.

Writers have looked at this Ethnic Protoplasm in various ways. Time was when the invasion of the Goths and Vandals was regarded as the grand calamity of civilization. Gibbon seems to lean that way, and is echoed by Macaulay, and we may add Hannah More. Then we begin to hear the other side. Rome with its civilization was already internally destroyed before this outer destruction fulfilled her own act. Not a day too soon did the Goths and Vandals appear before Rome, suggests Emerson, still holding that they were the instruments of the Destroyer. But a far more positive boon they conferred; they furnished that original material, raw indeed but fresh and incorrupt, out of which the new civilization was to be produced—the primal Ethnic Protoplasm from which Greece and Rome first sprang, and into which their decayed energies had again to be dipped for a new birth.

But who or what makes this dip, when civilization itself is diseased and its national upholder is weak and corrupt, if not dying? It is at these

great transitions, at these nodes that the World-Spirit can be best seen, the Power above History, yet of History, using Nations, civilized and uncivilized, as the instruments for its purpose. During centuries the periphery of Roman domination excluded the barbarous tribes of the North from sharing in its endowment, civilization, excluded them from the World-State whose end was a higher freedom. Thus the Ethnic Protoplasm was shut out from its destiny, and such exclusiveness was the real failure of Rome, wherein she contradicted the true end of History, the very purpose of the World-Spirit.

It is at this point and for this cause that judgment was decreed against Rome by the Supreme Tribunal of History, which in substance declared to her: you have denied the end of your being, so you are to perish through yourself, as well as through those whom you have excluded from their heritage. The ethnic peoples, though barbarous, sought the boon of civilzation, and were deprived of it; at last they broke down the barrier and took violently their prize, smiting its old form to pieces and then transforming it. The excluding rim of barbarous peoples drawn so bloodily by Rome and also by Greece, was what brought the latter into contradiction with the march of civilization, or as we say, with the decree of the World-Spirit, whose grand purpose was therein violated. What that purpose is may be next inquired about.

Section Second.

The State Universal.

Every thinking man who views the course of European History, or of any important historical epoch, cannot help asking himself: Whither is it all drifting? Unto what purpose is this mighty hurly-burly of events, to what goal is it sweeping? In other words thought demands an End, with which to satisfy not only its own cravings, but also to measure and judge in some fashion the great States and their crises appearing in History.

As History, in the sense we are dealing with it, is political History, and hence pertains to the State, the nature of the latter becomes of prime importance. At present it need only be said that the State, impressed with the stamp of its origin, seeks universality, which fact imparts to the onward movement of History the End lurking within its long line of events. Already in the foregoing account this End of History as the universal State has been mentioned several times incidentally, but will now be looked at more closely.

The End of History, then, as an evolution in Time, is the complete, universal State embracing not only all peoples but all races in its pro-

cess for securing freedom to the individual through the political Institution. The association of man sweeps wider and wider toward an integral institutional liberty. Such is indeed the working of the Genius of Civilization (or the World-Spirit) which seeks to institutionalize itself in the State universal, so that the individual may be universally free. Likewise the particular State is not to be outside of the process of History and thus destructible, but inside of it and thus permanent, though changing. The racial protoplasm of the whole globe, through its own inner activity as well as through the World-Spirit as artificer, is being formed into the total or universal State whose object is to secure, not a partial, but a truly universal freedom, to each member of the associated political Whole. The steps in the temporal movement toward this grand institutional unification of man are the great historic events of the ages, which, however, must be so set forth and formulated that this End, lurking in them all, be brought out and made manifest to the inquirer. It may be added that in this total historic movement of the globe, European History is by far the weightiest stage and most fully evolved; still it is but a stage or part.

Another important point about the universal State is that it must show itself the creator of particular States, which return to it and recreate

it as the genetic soul and source of themselves. In other words the universal State is by its very nature a State-making State, calling forth its own special States as the necessary members of its own organism. Such a universal State does not yet exist and seems far in the future; still it may be observed that the Constitution of the United States makes the Federal Union productive of new particular States, which become members of that Union. Thus we may hear the herald distinctly announcing the approach of the State universal.

I.

Accordingly, this End which we here call the Universal State lies in all History and is the innermost driving-wheel of its development, which is truly seeking to civilize (make *cives*) all mankind. Each State seeks to secure freedom through the Law, and this Law it applies to the individual. But ultimately the State itself must come under the Law of all States, or the Law of the State universal, which has as its object to safeguard freedom or Free-Will. The final question applied to every single State is: Are you obeying, realizing, enacting the Law of the State universal? If you are not, then comes the penalty in the shape of defeat, disorder and finally of death.

Every State, then, as it appears in Time doing

and leaving undone, is called before a Supreme Justiciary, who is to judge of it by the Law of the State universal, or by the highest end of the political Institution. The condemnation which we may read in the ruins of past States is: You are not universal, you are not true to your own highest Law, you have not in your acts obeyed the decree of the State Universal. Then another State is summoned to take up the burden of realizing that end or of advancing it to a new stage. Now the record of this High Tribunal, of the Ages set down in events is History, whose course is to reveal the movement of the particular State toward realizing itself as the State universal.

The interrogation now is: Who is this Supreme Justiciary thus placed over the line of States moving down Time, this world-judge who holds them to their own universal Law? Him we shall often cite and his decisions, especially at the great critical conjunctures; what else indeed is History at bottom? The name most frequently given him in this book of ours is the World-Spirit — the Spirit or Genius or Mind presiding over the World's History and uttering the decisions concerning Nations. Many such special decisions are plainly recorded, only there is a general one not so plain: when you, O, Nation, are carrying out the great end of History and marching directly toward its goal, though not

yet there by any means, you are in your bloom and show no sign of perishing; but when your particular end of the State is hostile to the universal State and its Law, which is to benefit and to safeguard not merely you but all, then you have begun your downward career toward insignificance and death.

Rome made the Roman Law and thus became a kind of World-Judge over the individuals of her vast empire: such indeed was her greatest, most peculiar work. But she was unable to enact and to fulfill the Supreme Law of the State universal, and thus met her own doom. Over the highest imperial judge, over the Emperor himself, stood a higher Justiciary applying really Rome's own Law to herself. Still her merit is to have made the State lawgiver to the citizens; but she did not and could not enact and carry out the Law of the State universal, and met her doom at last from the World-Spirit.

Undoubtedly this end of History is not yet realized in Europe, nor in America; it seems to lie as yet far beyond both. Still it is the soul pulsating in both, the Spirit we call it, the very Spirit of the World in History which is always pushing toward its end, the State universal, seeking to embrace the world in one great political Institution whose purpose is to secure man's freedom institutionally, that is, through all the rest, through universal association. The decrees

of History are to be read in the light of that illuminating end, which like the distant Sun controls History's movements and also sheds its light upon the same, so that we can see the sweep of their orbit.

But when the universal State is realized or far on the way thereto, will not the Supreme Justiciary, the World-Spirit, be still above it decreeing, judging and possibly condemning? We feel we may glimpse even his destiny from afar, he is longer *outside* the universal State — how can he be if it be universal? — but *inside* the same, having made some federation whose law then is the actual Law of the State universal. Thus the single State will not or need not be destroyed, even if corrected; its association with the whole will preserve it as particular. While the grand end of History keeps moving toward realization, the right and might of the World-Spirit becomes more and more internal in the complete political Institution — becomes a part or element of its actual process, hence no longer negative to it from the outside. An intimation of the manner in which the World-Spirit can be internalized by the universal State, may be caught from the working of the American Federal Union in regard to the particular States in its territory. Thus a world-peace, so much talked of in these days, is possible. The peculiarity of European History with its society of particular States (Poly-

archy) has been that the Word-Spirit wrought outside of them, clashing one against the other and causing their rise and fall through war.

Still another question rises concerning the relation of this soul of History to the soul of the All, of which it can be but a part or element — concerning the connection between the World-Spirit and the Absolute Spirit. Of the latter the former is indeed but one manifestation, with a multitude of others, such as we can find in Art, Religion, Science, Philosophy. The relation of these to each other and to History, as well as their evolution out of the All-Spirit (Pampsychosis) cannot here be given; only so much may be said that this universal Spirit is throwing out into Time and Place the movement toward the universal State as a temporal and spatial form of itself, whose record is History.

II.

In the preceding exposition we have sought to grasp and also to formulate categorically the two basic conceptions of European History — the two extremes of it, opposite, yet always interacting and finally co-operating to bring forth the one great historic result — the Ethnic Protoplasm and the World-Spirit. Now these two poles of the Universe of History have, along with their interrelated action, their own separate pro-

cess — a fact which must be taken into account. Each must be seen as it is in itself as well as in its co-working with the other.

First of all we are to conceive the Ethnic Protoplasm not as a mere inert mass of humanity which is to be moved from the outside and stamped with an impress wholly foreign to itself. On the contrary it has its own inner movement, it has its own institutions, which, though rude and germinal, have a process in themselves creative of the coming institutional world. We should also note that the Ethnic Protoplasm is the common element underlying both Asia and Europe, and thus is the connecting mass between these two continental divisions, which in it are not yet explicitly divided, even if on the way thereto.

We shall for our present purpose take the Village Community as the original cell of the protoplasmic mass of peoples, though the Family and some other social forms may antedate it somewhat in origin. Still the institutional genesis of the European State and its unfolding is best seen by a start from the Village Community, upon which recent investigation has thrown a great flood of illumination. Its first characteristic is that the land is held in common, so that the whole is justly called a community, and exhibits the primitive communism of man yet uncivilized. Moreover this community holds its

members in such a strong communal bond that they can hardly yet be called individualized, each person being directly determined by the social Whole. The result is, such a community is easily movable, it is not necessarily confined to one piece of territory; like a flock of blackbirds it rises and flies and lights on different plots of earth, according to desire or necessity. There is little doubt that the Aryan migration into Europe moved in the units of the Village Community, combined of course into tribes, peoples and stocks. The Teutons who invaded the Roman Empire, came not merely as individual combatants, but they brought along their wives, children and movable property, and especially their social organization. Not so much the man as the Village Community migrated in vast throngs.

Next we may cast a glance into the germinal government which arises in the Village Community. This early State will show a single ruler of some kind, a body of elders, and some form of a popular assembly. Already present though quite undeveloped are monarchy, aristocracy and democracy — the one, the few and the many — in a primordial originating process with one another. Moreover the great strife of governmental forms has begun — the perennial strife between Monarchos, Aristos, and Demos for supreme authority. Hence these Village Communities

will show considerable differences among themselves, with tendencies towards one of the three, and toward some combination of the three or two. An embryonic Constitution we thus observe in the Village Community, whence springs the constitutional development of Europe in its latest forms, which may be monarchic, aristocratic, democratic, or mixed in various proportions. It is evident that the Ethnic Protoplasm, made up of these active Village Communities, contains a strong evolutionary element, truly the potentiality of European History, through which runs the struggle of Monarchos, Aristos, and Demos for partial or total power in the community or the commonwealth, small and large. Such is the fundamental protoplasmic process of peoples, and in it lurks the deepest movements of Folk-Soul as political.

These small institutional units, called Village Communities, will next combine themselves into larger wholes — clan, tribe, nation, race — according to their own inherent creative principle of association. We may suppose at the great battle of Poitiers (732, A. D.), a feeling of race united the Teutonic and perchance Celtic tribes as Aryan, against the invading Semitic Arabians. Still the real unit, the primordial cell of association in the Ethnic Protoplasm is the Village Community, till it passes over into a new organization such as the City

Commonwealth like early Athens and early Rome, in which, however, the contests between Monarchos, Aristos, and Demos continue, and are intensified, becoming also historic. These three forms will remain, evolving through all the forms of the State from the first to the last. They are the original Constitution which makes a State, its original political cell or em bryo, and unfolds with civilization.

It is a great transition of History when the ownership of property becomes individual. The State gets a new and most important function: it has to secure that individual property to its owner. With the breaking-up of the communal ownership of the Village Community, the historic epoch of Europe begins to dawn, the massed Ethnic Protoplasm of peoples starts to differentiate into civilized States, which put stress upon the security of the rights of the individual. It is interesting to note here that there are modern attempts to return to this primitive Village Community with its naive communism as the great social ideal. Such efforts of reversion spring up everywhere on the mighty, forward rushing stream of modern civilization.

Manifestly the Ethnic Protoplasm of Europe has within itself the force of evolution. It is to unfold into its complete governmental form, which is self government. The original Viliage

Community has little power of association beyond itself; hence it has to be associated by others like itself through external might, till this can be outgrown. Its rise as civilized was first into the Greek City-State, with which European History properly opens. It has still further unfolded into the Modern Nation-State, and the original constitutional germ has developed into many elaborate written Constitutions, even into an overarching Federal Constitution of Constitutions, all of which have still to deal with that primordial institutional trio — Monarchos, Aristos, Demos.

Such is the one side or the one extreme we may say, which has within itself the budding point of evolution or of the rise toward the universal State. Now we are to get a view of the other side, which seems to command, to authorize, yea perchance to originate from above as it were just this evolutionery movement of massed humanity from below upward.

III.

More pressing becomes the need of getting some definite conception of the relation and interaction between the Ethnic Protoplasm and the World-Spirit, both of which belong to European History, but which reach out before it and after it — we may in a sense deem them

Europe's pre-European and post-European factors. The immanent and transcendent principles of History they are, in opposition to each other, yet co-operating ultimately to the one great end — the two opposites, nodes of the ever-moving cycle of the globe's events, the protoplasmic and the world-historical.

The Ethnic Protoplasm has its own inner power of self-development; it unfolds of itself into governmental forms or States from its germinal institutions, as has been already noted. Such a fact, however, calls up the idea or category of Evolution, whose inherent nature must be to evolve out of itself. It can only be a part or stage, the rise indeed to higher and higher forms toward the attainment of the highest, which is the ideal end driving it from the start. But what is this highest end? It must be that which creates evolution itself, or evolves evolution evolving, and thus returns to the starting point of the evolutionary rise. The immanent movement thus calls for its other half or counterpart, both together forming the total process.

The protoplasmic element is the evolutionary one of European History, unfolding peoples and governments till this day. But its power of Evolution is something given, as is also the end toward which it evolves and which really starts it and gives to it its inner propulsion. That end is the State universal whose fulfilment and real-

ization is presided over by the World-Spirit Still we must grasp that the State universal lies implicitly in the Ethnic Protoplasm as a far-off potentiality, which it is to make actual. Such a State perpetually reproduces itself, that is, creates the particular States which recreate it as creator, or as universal. Thus the Ethnic Protoplasm in its final outcome may be conceived as returning into its own origin and reproducing itself.

But History is far enough from having realized any such universal State, though this is beginning to be glimpsed in the distance. It has, however, always been felt and indeed has been active as the hidden propelling power in the unconscious depths of the Folk-Soul. The Ethnic Protoplasm holds within itself the blind but throbbing potentiality of the State universal, and hence it has a germ which Time, or better the World-Spirit, can develop. Really it is evolving toward the end which makes it and sets it going. As it approaches the realization of the State universal, it becomes more complete within itself, and embraces in its own inner process the World-Spirit, who is also the judge and can be the destroyer of particular States which do not fulfil or have violated the great end of History. When the particular State is fulfilling the decree of the universal State, then the former is in its bloom, and is victorious over its inner and outer enemies.

It has indeed a powerful ally, none other than the World-Spirit, who has often given Marathonian triumphs to the few against uncountable multitudes. Hence in the study of History and its seeming sport of eventualities, the first thing is to hear the judgment of its supreme tribunal concerning the given instance, which is some particular State acting an historic part.

What is the end, for example, of the ever-recurring rounds of conflict between Europe and West-Asia? Let us bring before ourselves the World-Spirit circling in these rounds of which History records three, drawing nearer and nearer toward the State universal, or toward the complete harmony and co-operation of Polyarchy and Henarchy, in which the World-Spirit is seeking to realize itself through historic development. On the one hand we may look at History from the standpoint of Evolution, and behold the racial Folk-Soul which lurks in the protoplasm of Aryan Village Communities unfolding toward its end, the State universal. On the other hand we may look at History from the standpoint of the World-Spirit and behold it moving, directing and even originating this same evolution for its own self-realization, which is likewise to take place in the State universal. Both standpoints are indeed necessary and complementary, constituting the entire movement of History when duly set forth.

We have spoken of the condemnation of the particular State by the Supreme Justiciary, the World-Spirit. But we must not leave out that such condemnation is also its own, springing from its violation of its own deepest principle. An internal and also external judgment we must find, then, in all the great rises and falls of historic States, the decree being always issued in accord with the law of the State universal.

IV.

At this point we have to consider the third element which we may well conceive as lying between and mediating the two elements already set forth. This is the Great Man, the mighty individual or historic hero of his people or race. Such a figure is the most striking in all History, and at once draws the attention and sympathy of the reader who is also an individual and human like him, being possibly inclined to turn away from those thought-shapes, the World-Spirit and Folk-Soul, as pure specters and unrealities which we have conjured up before him. So we must look at and penetrate the great historic character placed at the nodes of History. And we must consider him particularly in the present connection not merely as he is in himself or as an individual, but as per-

forming a part, verily a pivotal part, in the World's History.

The great historic character primarily shares in the World-Spirit whose end, the State universal, he feels or perchance sees, being filled and inspired with it, and is thus its vehicle for his time and people, in whose essence likewise he deeply participates. On the one hand he is supernally endowed and connected; on the other he is an individual of flesh and blood, like the rest of us. Such are his extremes; but between these he has another relation, since he partakes profoundly of the spirit of his people, or the Folk-Soul. Thus he becomes the connecting link between the State universal and the State particular; we may call him in his supreme historic function the mediator between the World-Spirit and the Folk-Soul.

These thoughts upon the Great Man we shall unfold further. The State universal seeking to realize itself in the State particular, as it must, does not function itself directly but through an individual. The World-Spirit must have an instrument filled with its end, which is to be embodied and made active in the People, or in what we have called the Ethnic Protoplasm. At this point we see the chief purpose of the Great Man in History: he is to bridge the chasm between the State particular and the State universal; he is to recognize both sides, to commune with them

and to bring them together, producing usually the bloom of his State at a given time.

In this way the Great Man as statesman brings his own people to their highest worth and deed, and forestalls the Destroyer. For every nation, unless it does the saving positive act of its period and of itself, is judged and passes into obscuration and final evanishment. The Great Man, we repeat, is the mediator between the two extremes of European History, the World-Spirit and the Folk-Soul, participating in both and indeed realizing both. Nothing is more significant than the colossal appearance of the Great Man at the nodes of History. What is he doing? Who called him up?

We can say that the universal State evokes the universal Man, yet human and existent in a particular State and time. He is to function for his age this universal State, seeking to make it actual, and turning it from its possible negative external might into its positive preservative and creative office. The World-Man we may also name him on account of his universal genius which beholds, communes with and realizes the World-Spirit in the World-State. It is evident that we now have the triple round working together for the one grand result: the World-Spirit, the World-Man, and the World-State. Of course they form a process, in fact a psychical

process of which the three are members producing actively the whole which is likewise in each.

The evolution of European History goes by stages, by rises and falls which are links in its great circling chain. This is made up of the particular States which have come and gone. We may deem evolution the immanent movement of the Ethnic Protoplasm. On the other hand there is something which runs through and connects in unity, in one great transcendent purpose all these separate links, these particular States flowing down time. This unifying power is the World-Spirit, which at given intervals calls for and causes to evolve the World-States of History. But between these two elements is working the World-Man and completing their process.

Alexander, Caesar, Constantine, to cite the greatest ones of this class in antiquity, are supremely such mediating characters standing at the grand crises of European History. Their right appreciation is a fundamental requirement in historic study; misunderstood they necessarily dislocate the whole process of History in the student's mind. To be sure the stress must be upon the right thing, upon the universal rather than the individual element of the Great Man, who besides being great is also small—a poor mortal with his full quota of human weaknesses. Personally he may be tricked out with a number of motives of little moral worth, as love of

power, fame, money; vindictive, cruel, profane he may be, and yet be the chosen conduit of the spirit above to the world below. In fact a certain school of psychologists, chief of whom is Lombroso, has maintained that all genius is insane —the greater the man the crazier. The followers of Lombroso deem him a genius, probably he deemed himself such— was he then insane, too, and are his speculations those of a madman? Undoubtedly the great man has a strain in him different from that of ordinary people, but this is just the universal element which makes him the most sane and truly whole man, because universal, of his epoch. The World-Spirit, taking possession of the individual, does not make him mad but integral rather, integrating him with itself and thus making him on this side a World-Man.

Still even the greatest historic individual has in him the finitude of individuality. We may note the three characteristics of him, fundamental in the present connection. (1) He has his own particular interest, passion, motive, to subserve in his supreme act. (2) He is one with his people, sharing completely in the Folk-Soul or in the particular State of his time. (3) He bears within himself and manifests in his deed the grand end of History, the universal State, thus realizing for his period the World-Sprit. All three elements belong to his character in

which they may and do usually conflict; but his greatness is that he unflinchingly subordinates the two lower to the one higher. Caesar as individual was weak, had the falling-sickness (see Shakespeare); he was also intensely national as a Roman; but as the world-historical Great Man of his age he obeyed the behest of the World-Spirit and bore his nation out of the old Republic into the new Empire. In Lincoln also we can trace the same three elements of character — the moral, the national and the world-historical — often conflicting painfully within him, yet always in the end subordinated to the one great end of the World-Spirit.

V.

The supreme characteristic of the State universal must be the creative one, that is, it must be State-making, productive of particular States. In the political world of the present time there is no universal State existent, we behold only particular States on the map of the globe. Yet all spring from and contain the idea of the State, or the ideal State, which we have named the State universal. This is not simply a combination of States for some special end as war, mutual profit, commerce, etc. Directly it is not produced by the particular States, but primarily produces them, being the creative principle of all States.

The universal State just through its universality must be self-creating, like the Universe, and so must be State-creating through its own nature. In thought, then, we have to grasp the universal State generating particular States, which in their turn seek to reproduce it as their highest end. But this very search or striving of the particular States for their end is a movement of them in Time and gives History, which is, therefore, a return of the particular States to their originating source, the State universal. The latter is not yet realized, but in the process of realization, which is seen in the historic march of nations toward their supreme end.

Let us now take a glance at the other side of this same process. If we reach down to the Ethnic Protoplasm we find that it has been left seemingly to itself, to its own instinct in the matter of State-making. Tribes have coalesced and formed States in obedience to some impulse which History does not and cannot record. The making of the nations of Europe has been under no conscious, intelligent national supervision, either in the particular case or in the entirety. States have come and gone, have pushed themselves apparently into existence, and then have been crushed and absorbed by other States. The result is a furious mass of chaotically struggling States on the surface of History, whose end is difficult at first to see.

It has been already noticed that this original

Aryan protoplasm of European peoples is what has been repeatedly drawn upon for renewing the vitality of the State, when the latter has been exhausted. But now it would seem that this primitive material of State-building has been quite expended; there are no more tribes barbarously fresh and unspoiled, to be seized in the limits of Europe; at least such material is all fenced in and pre-empted by the European nations. What, then, is Europe to do for her future State-creation, or even for the rehabilitation of herself or parts of herself in case of need? That is surely one of her great political problems. Here we find one chief reason for her desperate clutching after extra-European peoples and their territories. Europe must now get out of Europe for its needful supply of Ethnic Protoplasm; to furnish this seems to be the great historic function of barbarism, which thus has its place and gives its contribution to advancing and perpetuating civilization, till the latter ceases to be nation-devouring and conquers its negative element. Certainly Europe is overflowing other continents, particularly the adjoining Africa and Asia, appropriating them at a very rapid rate. But in this act a new problem arises; Europe is essentially uniracial — can she form civilized nations out of other races than her own, and thus become multiracial and also multireligious?

These problems, though knocking at the door of the present belong to the future for solution.

Looking back again at the historic past, one has to say that in Europe the evolving protoplasm of peoples has not been able to reach truly the State-making State, the State as universal or sharing the nature of universality and thus creating the particular States which are to reconstitute it as actually universal, and thereby as having its own genetic process within itself. The European genesis of states has been left quite to the inner impulse working in and through outer circumstances. And still there has been a control which has directed them toward realizing the great end of History, which control we have repeatedly designated as the task of the World-Spirit. This accordingly appears as an outer power or energy over European History, that is, over the evolutinary movement of the European State or Polyarchy of States, which seem to have arisen, flourished and fallen of themselves, as if left wholly to their own inner process. And still there is a Plan running through them all; or if you choose an Artificer has been moulding them out of the given primordial Ethnic Protoplasm, and ordering their rise, bloom and fall toward an end already often named the State universal.

VI.

It has been already acknowledged that the State universal has never been realized in an actually

existent political form. It remains an ideal end toward which history is marching, and which lurks in the historic movement of the State quite unconsciously, even if this be getting more and more aware of itself. One is, therefore, impelled to ask, what existent State or governmental form is the nearest to the State universal, the most complete embodiment thereof? We shall give our answer at once; the American Union or, as we shall often name it, in contrast with the Orient and Europe, the Occidental State.

We shall first take note of man as instinctively State-producing; this is the larger meaning of Aristotle's famous declaration in which he calls man a political (State-making) animal. But this activity is very diverse and has shown many stages or grades. We have already looked at the Ethnic Protoplasm, in which the State-producing Ego is very primitive, unconcious, not yet evolved out of barbarism. Still it is at work and shows a basic political norm in the Village Community. On the other hand we can see the State-making Ego as not only aware of its own character but as having realized itself in a State which is purposely and consciously State-making. This is what we find expressed in the constitution of the United States, and is really the most significant and farthest-reaching portion of the instrument. Hence the American Federal Union is the latest form in the evolution of the State,

and is the highest manifestation as yet of the State universal, the end of History. Thus it becomes a kind of test by which we may judge of the other forms of the State which have gone before it in the Orient and in Europe, and which have unfolded into it as the most recent phase of political development. In it has become explicit what lay in the antecedent States of History, and thus it is their real explanation, foreshadowing likewise the direction of historic evolution. The last stage of a process interprets the first and what lies between; the oak not only explicates the acorn, but also reproduces it afresh, and that is its final explication. From this point of view the American Union, whose highest attribute is State-producing, is the latest explication of History, and reveals more nearly the State universal, than any other governmental form hitherto evolved. But certainly the claim cannot be made that it is the grand finality of History, which does not propose to stop evolving.

At first, then, the human being builds his little State instinctively as a bee does his cell, making also clusters of cells united externally in a hive. Similarly that primary form of the State called the Village Community had its clusters in the vast mass which was named Ethnic Protoplasm.

At last, however, the human being builds not

merely a State singly, but a State which is itself State-making, reproducing the single State out of itself through its own concious act, which is set down in its written Constitution. Thus the State has become purposely creative of itself as its supreme function, reproducing the particular State which reproduces it, and therein beginning to manifest that character which is to be fully realized in the State universal.

Thus we behold on the stage of History the interplay between the State particular and the State universal, which latter on the one hand is the end and on the other is the source of the former as this originates and unfolds in Time. Moreover we begin now to catch the three greatest sweeps of history as well as the ground of their distinction, in the movement toward this end. These will come up again but we shall briefly designate them here from the present point of view.

(1) The Orient—the State universal puts down the States particular. That is, the historic manifestation of the State universal in the form of the Oriental Empire suppresses the individual as State and also as person. It cannot endure its own particularity, which it deems the lapse of itself or fall, indeed its own destruction. Hence the continued strain and stress of every great Monarchy of the East is to overcome all other countries adjacent to it as limiting its own uni-

versality. To be sure it is thus undoing itself, for the greatest empire of the Orient is still limited, is still a particular State. Such however is the primal historic manifestation of the State universal, showing itself in the self-negation of the State particular both inner and outer, which however, still keeps rising as a necessary part of the process out of the Ethnic Protoplasm. Or, speaking metaphorically we may say that the State as parent in the Orient seems to have an inborn hostility to the State as child, and seeks in one way or the other to suppress the same.

(2) Europe — the States particular put down the State universal. It has already been observed that the political characteristic of Europe is the Polyarchy — in Greek antiquity the Polyarchy of City-States, in modern times the Polyarchy of Nation-States. Still the manifestation of the State universal has not been wanting in European History — witness its partial realization in the Roman Empire and in other lesser examples. But the State, particular in Europe, having put down its universal or creative common element, cannot organically unite with other States particular; the result is destructive wars, and almost equally destructive armaments in peace. The States particular in Europe also rise out of the Ethnic Protoplasm capriciously, without any national or international supervision.

(3) The Occident — the State universal (in its historic manifestation) now creates consciously the States particular, which in turn re-create their creative parent, and keep doing so — which is the latest process of History, as far as it has yet realized its end. The origin of the State is no longer left to the irregular and uncertain evolution of the Ethnic Protoplasm, or of barbarous peoples, but is consciously supervised and directed according to the institutional principle of the time or nation performing such a task. Thus the State-making State has appeared and begins to control its own origination — which fact is not found either in the Orient or Europe, both of which leave the rise of the State to the instinctive action of the Ethnic Protoplasm. Moreover it is at this point that we can begin to glimpse the universal State realizing itself as the end of History.

From this point of view we may see the supreme end of History unfolding into its three chief divisions, as far as it has been hitherto realized in place and time. Also we may see that the third division or stage (the Occidental) in a very important matter returns to and interlinks with the first (the Oriental): the State universal becomes again the paramount factor in the existent State, which, however, no longer subjugates the State particular as its enemy, but actually creates it and preserves it as a necessary

part of itself. Moreover this State particular, instead of shivering to pieces the one supreme State (as we see in Polyarchic Europe) recreates it continually and preserves it as a necessary part of itself. Of course in this process of the Occidental State, I am simply describing and historically correlating the fundamental principle of the American Federal Union as set forth in its Constitution.

VII.

Territorially, Asia and Europe are one and continuous. The dividing line between them is not drawn by nature, as is the case with the other grand divisions of the globe, which are either separated wholly by large bodies of water, or are joined merely by narrow strips of land, like Suez and Panama. This fact has its important historic bearing, since the primal migration of peoples could take place on a large scale only between Asia and Europe.

Here we impinge upon a second fact: Asia and Europe are conjoined by one underlying stratum of peoples racially the same — this is our Aryan Ethnic Protoplasm. At present, however, we bring it up as the connecting tissue which primordially interweaves the two continents in a pre-historic unity. The essential fact of this Protoplasm for us is that it bears within itself man's earliest political institution, the

Village Community. Moreover it has the tendency, indeed the strong impulse, to flow out of Asia into Europe; seldom does it move back eastward, till it has become civilized in its European home and seeks to return to its early sources. Here again we come upon the very important fact of migration in the World's History, not yet ceased to-day.

What is this migrating Protoplasm of people trying to do? At least trying to get out of the Orient with its Patriarchy, with its crushing hand laid upon the particular Community, be it State or Village. So the latter flees to a Continent where it may develop its particularity and remain in separation. To use terms already employed, the Ethnic Protoplasm of the Aryan race migrates from the Asiatic Henarchy, usually called a despotism, to the European Polyarchy in search of a higher freedom. Or more precisely, it divides within itself, a part remains in the East and a part moves Westward and forms a new order. Asia thus separates itself primarily and particularizes itself in Europe. Here the reader, scanning this process of the World's History, may well recall that it is analogous to the process of his own consciousness, of the human Ego, which corresponds to the All-Ego (Pampsychosis) passing through the stages of the World's History, and thus historicizing itself in the migra-

grations of man on the face of the globe, to the end of bringing forth the universal State as its final and complete historic realization.

Naturally the inquiring student asks after the origin of the Ethnic Protoplasm. Undoubtedly it presupposes man associative, combining with his fellow-man in institutions through the very fact of having an Ego, or more definitely a Will. Now Man is one of the three grand constituents of the Universe, which is usually thought as made up of God, World and Man, and whose process is that of the before-mentioned All-Ego (Pampsychosis.) In Asia this Man, being associative through Will, evolves into the Ethnic Protoplasm on the one side, yet into the Oriental State on the other, whose pressure from above would seem to have the tendency to push vast masses of protoplasmic humanity into Europe, into a new stage of the movement toward the State universal.

Further delving into the psychological presuppositions of History we shall omit as these properly belong to another science for their full elaboration. But we may note here the same thought in the movement of Religion, which has its originative sources in the Orient. The Oriental conception of God in the main makes him suppressive of, if not hostile to, the individual man, whom He, however, has created. In like manner the Oriental State puts down or destroys its own particular States, in its capa-

city of asserting the State universal which is the origin of all particular States. The pantheistic God of the Universe, so common in the East, is the foe of all particularity, causing it to vanish as a drop in the Ocean. And yet it is also an Oriental conception of God that He at last "in the fullness of time" particularlizes himself in a Son through whom all humanity is divinized. Still the full development of this new religion takes place not in Asia, but in Europe, the home and indeed the refuge of particularity from Asiatic suppression, which is of course deemed oppression. Already we have dwelt upon the autonomous particular States of Europe (Polyarchy) as its distinctive political characteristic.

Sufficiently we have unfolded the end of History as the State universal; now we are to see this ideal end realizing itself outwardly in Space and Time, in locality and in movement. This brings up the Migration of Peoples as a grand fact in the World's History, which fact deserves its separate treatment in some detail. Let us not forget, however, in the external occurrences that the mentioned Peoples are migrating toward the end of all History, that the Ethnic Protoplasm is straining out toward the State universal, that the Oceanic roll of humanity out of Asia into Europe and across the sea to America is the very incarnation and visible appearance of the world-historical process.

Section Third.

Circummigration.

Often have we spoken of migration, particularly that of the Ethnic Protoplasm from Asia into Europe — a more or less limited movement of peoples. But we are now to rise to the thought and the fact of Circummigration, primarily the migration round the globe, secondarily the migration in a bounded circuit of territory, especially that of Europe. Circumnavigation of the globe was a great typical act suggestive of the future and giving just celebrity to the first man who brought it about, be his name Portuguese or English. But Circummigration is far greater and more significant, being the work not merely of an individual or of a nation, but of a race.

All races seemingly migrate more or less within a given range, so do animals and birds. There is, however, one race which seems to have in it the capacity and the impulse for a world-migration, the push and the aspiration to sweep round the globe, encircling it with a racial belt of successive peoples back to their original starting point. In forty minutes Puck, Shakespeare's far-darting sprite, might put his prophetic girdle round the earth; in forty historic centuries,

more or less, the Aryans seem destined to perform a similar feat, though actual and composed of veritable flesh and blood.

The Circummigration of the globe gives not only the setting of the World's History, but suggests its movement, of which Europe is only one great station or stopping-place on the road — the middle or central hostelry of the World-Spirit, so far as this has yet traveled on its historic journey through the aeons. Now it is our Aryan Ethnic Protoplasm which migrates and keeps migrating, propelled seemingly by the instinct of Circummigration, which may be regarded as its deepest and most abiding racial characteristic, being transmitted from father to son for a hundred generations, and working as vigorously to-day, and far more intelligently, than when our crepuscular ancestry began to strike out westward from somewhere in the misty Asiatic Highland of Hindoo Kush or the Pamir. Such a framework of European History we have to conceive, there being both a pre-European and post-European stage — the one telling more of origin and the other more of end, whereby we may follow the budding, flowering and fruitage of the World's History, or at least of one great cycle of it, to be succeeded probably by other cycles.

In the foregoing account we have mentioned one race (the Aryan) as possessing most em-

phatically the instinct or gift of Circummigration, and as having realized it by practice and developed it by inheritance for many successive centuries. Undoubtedly in this vast movement the white non-Aryan stocks of West-Asia and Europe have taken part, Semitic and even Turanian; but in the main these have been absorbed by the Aryan. There are, however, other races beside the Aryan or even the white race on this planet of ours; what is their part in the World's History? One of these has shown the capacity of becoming civilized, to be sure in its own way. For thousands of years the yellow race substantially within its original seats has developed its own civilization, while the white race has gone forward in its career of Circummigration, continually moving outside of itself toward encompassing racially the globe and bearing with itself its social and institutional order. These are now the two races facing each other on the arena of the World's History. Moreover there are other backward races, which seem to be in a condition to furnish a new sort of Ethnic Protoplasm, very different from that Aryan sort which we have already seen to be the substrate and original building material of European History, yet similar in possibility and purpose. Here at this soul-straining outlook into futurity, we can only say that the World's History seems on the point of becoming multiracial instead of uniracial, as

it has been hitherto, and of uniting in one historic process the two civilized races at least, and possibly of employing the backward peoples of the globe still as Ethnic Protoplasm for recuperation and rejuvenescence.

The fact must also be emphasized that the movement of the Aryan race has been from East to West as if in pursuit of the fleeing Sun, which seems to circle through the Heavens in the same direction. Only a few centuries ago, however, the fact came to light that the Sun does not flee, but that it is the Earth who both flees and approaches, revolving around the central luminary and at the same time turning on her own axis. So the Earth performs and keeps performing her grand act of Circummigration round the skies for the physical illumination of her children who are also circummigrating over her surface. It is likewise to be noted that this Aryan movement of peoples, which is that of History too, has its deep correspondence with the cosmical order, and is in a manner determined by Nature from above. When it has completed its Circummigration, as it now seems destined to do, and when it starts on some new career of development, will this relation of it to the physical universe be changed also? Will the Aryan in his racial progress still follow the Sun, and repeat his first historic cycle? And will he in this higher domain also celebrate his triumph

over the determinism of Nature, as he has so long been doing in lesser fields? Such questions in regard to the future will arise in the mind, and are to be duly noted, though their answer lies not in the ken of the present World's History, which has just begun to look into the face of its first great Circummigration.

We can, accordingly, assert from existing knowledge that the Aryan is not simply a migrating, but a circummigrating race. With this thought in mind as a kind of key to its deepest instinct, we can come back to our historic theme, Europe, which is a stage of this vast racial Circummigration of the globe, and which receives its primal outline from the same entering its territory and then after many centuries setting out across the Ocean for America.

I.

Our first look scans the geographical character of the country through which the transition has to be made by a primitive race, which has small means for surmounting physical obstacles, especially for passing over large bodies of water. Moreover the Aryan man in his original home, seems to have had little or no experience with the Sea. His Greek descendant had to acquire that under long-lasting, favorable circumstances, of which something will be said later.

Practically there are two entrances by land into Europe from Asia. The entrance by water, by the Mediterranean, could hardly be employed by the primitive immigrant. Looking at the territorial configuration of the twain, we seem to behold vast Asia moving out of itself into little Europe, a corner made up of lesser corners. In other words the solid Asiatic mass breaks up into a peninsula which in turn still further divides, in accord with its basic physical character into many smaller peninsulas. Thus we may behold the Orient separating within itself and particularizing itself in the superficial area of Europe, which thereby shows its character prefigured in outline on the very surface of its soil.

The first of these entrances by land is the Russian or anciently the Scythian, through which principally the Tartar race has at various times poured its hordes to swoop down upon Europe. This gateway is not mountainous as we might think from most of our maps; between the Ural range and the Caspian sea lies an open plain 400 miles broad, which gives an unobstructed passage from Asia to Europe. Being grassy and also largely treeless, this steppe not only supports but even entices the wild nomadic horsemen of the Turanian East to rove across into the civilized West. In pre-historic times it is probable

that Aryan offshoots also came by this route into Europe.

The second entrance has however played a far more important part in History than the first. It lies between two seas mainly, the Black and the Mediterranean, and is itself a peninsula, the Anatolian, usually known to-day under the name of Asia Minor or Lesser Asia, though it might be named just as well Lesser Europe. Really it belongs as much to Europe as to Asia, being a kind of transition between the two which shows Asia becoming peninsular as it moves westward toward Europe. Moreover it leads directly to the line of Mediterranean peninsulas, in which ancient Civilization developed and passed through to the Atlantic. It is probable that the earliest waves of the Aryan immigration rolled from the the heights of Asia through this Anatolian peninsula over the narrow straits of Bosporus (literally Cow-passage) into the Hellenic peninsula, and there started the European movement, after dropping many less aspiring fragments by the way, which will afterwards take up Greek culture. Thus the Anatolian peninsula can be regarded as the Asiatic prelude of Europe's grand peninsular symphony which we may still hear playing.

Such are the two entrances through which Asia has often poured over into Europe and through which Europe has often surged back into Asia.

Both these movements, the progressive and the regressive, must be ultimately joined together, thus forming the fundamental process of History. In fact between the possession of these two gateways the round of European Civilization has whirled, beginning with its earliest manifestation in the Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor, and circling the lands of sea and ocean till it comes to the newest European State, Russia, which holds now the old Scythian gateway. The sea, however, gets mastered and becomes no longer an obstacle but the means of inter-communication between the Mediterranean civilized peoples.

It is to be noticed that the point where this second entrance crosses the narrow dividing strip of water, has long been a point of contention between the two civilizations, Asiatic and European, each seeking to possess it. The old Greek saw its value and put two colonies there, one on each side, Byzantium and Chalcedon. At the great separation between East and West when the Roman Empire became divided, Constantine was the far-seeing statesman who grasped and realized the importance of this passage which practically joins the two opposing peninsulas, the Anatolian and the Balkan, and with them East-Europe and West-Asia — these two constituting the chief domain of the future Byzantine Empire. Here Constantine founded his

capital, named after himself and lying on the line of division, indeed at the chief point of contact, between Asia and Europe, both of which it might be able to unite once more and to put under a common rule, in a manner restoring that prehistoric ethnic unity which History hitherto had rent asunder. So much for the land connection of Constantinople: its water connection is also important, controlling as it does the short and narrow strait between the two great seas — the Euxine and the Mediterranean. Its site has been often pronounced to be the best for a great city on the globe. To possess it with the two adjoining peninsulas has been the chief pivot of the two great Periods of European History, Medieval and Modern. The Arabian Mahommedan tried to grasp it for many centuries, at last the Turk got it and still holds it. Russia, Austria, Greece, and England all want it, but keep one another off, through whose mutual counteraction the present anti-European possessor is able to stay in Europe.

Asia may, accordingly, be said to peninsularize itself in Europe. This means primarily territorial division of the Asiatic mass; the land is individualized, as if being prepared for the new abode of the new individual, man. The great empires of the East have broken to pieces against separative Europe, never having subjected it, though it too has had its imperial governments,

which have revolved back to the East and ruled it or the western part of it for ages. But the great fact of the peninsula in general is that land and water are brought more closely together; the sea first enters History and after it the ocean. Particularly the Mediterranean has been a determining element in European Civilization. Primordially the sea furnishes a protecting wall against the measureless waves of savagery which periodically have overflowed Asiatic lands and even Eastern Europe. Behind these marine walls, especially in Greece, infant communities were born and grew into separate autonomy. European Civilization starts distinctly into being when the early Greeks begin the mastery of their peninsular and insular waters, and use them as a weapon for winning and keeping their freedom. Whereof the most notable instance is Salamis. In Asia civilized man is largely a land animal, at best he timorously paddles in the great Oriental rivers; but in Europe when he reaches the Aegaean, he becomes amphibious and stays so, and indeed is getting more so. Every great European nation to-day has or seeks to have a marine as well as a territorial side of national existence.

The peninsula has played a weighty part in calling up and sustaining the idea of nationality in Europe. The Greek, the Italic, and the Spanish peninsulas were Nature's enclosures destined for one people, and helped nationalize

the diverse tribes and communities within and by means of their limits. It is in these Mediterranean peninsulas that the tribal sense first becomes national — the future nation being fenced in and half compelled to be.

Thus the ancient civilization of Europe moved outward through the three peninsulas of the North-Mediterranean, which fact constitutes a most important stage in the total monument of European History, and also of the World's History. The circummigration of the Aryan race has in this portion of its career passed over and completed a very significant arc of its entire cycle, which we may call the Mediterranean arc. Yet it is but an arc of the great totality. We should recall here that the sweep of History is a circling march of peoples westward around the globe toward the grand historic end, which is internally or ideally the State universal. The outer manifestation in Space and Time of this grand march of the Aryan Folk-Soul is the mighty deed of circummigration now consummating itself in the latest act of the World's History, whereby the beginning and end territorially seem to be coming together

II.

Another geographical matter which has to be considered in the present connection is that the

foregoing circummigration has taken place in one Hemisphere, the Northern. The three continental divisions which have separated the World's History into Oriental, European and Occidental, and which have thus primarily determined it, lie in the Northern half of the globe. From this point of view we can say that civilization even in its three largest sweeps hitherto, has been hemispherical, and so does not yet fully embrace the whole of the terrestrial sphere. Such an outer limit is placed upon it, and probably indicates some inner or spiritual limit, which still remains for the future to transcend.

The result is that, if we treat our theme universally, we cannot leave out of our view the total Globe with its divisions. In one direction we conceive it separated into two Hemispheres, Northern and Southern; divided in the other direction it falls again into two Hemispheres, Eastern and Western. Thus we have four divisions of the Globe, each of which is in one way hemispherical, and may be called a Hemisphere with the proper adjective added, though really they are quarters of the whole. In other words, the four hemispherical divisions may be named the East-Northern, West-Northern, West-Southern and East-Southern.

Now that quarter of the Globe which has been hitherto the chief seat of History is what we designate as the East–Northern Hemisphere,

embracing Asia and Europe. Civilization has not in the past gone South of the Equator, though it is going thither at the present time with great rapidity.

In that half of the Globe there is much less land and it is much more disconnected, its main divisions being sundered by large bodies of water. But in the East-Northern Hemisphere lies one vast territory connected together and containing the greater part of the Globe's land. In it is one unbroken path (barring streams) half way round the earth and more. Here the primitive man, with his crude means of transport could and did migrate. Undoubtedly he migrated in other quarters of the Globe, but not with the same facility, being quite unable to circummigrate.

Thus Asia easily passes over into Europe in human undulations on land, meeting little physical obstruction. The movement of the World's History rests primarily upon this migration of peoples, particularly that sweep from East to West with the corresponding rebounds and resurgences. Only in the East-Northern quarter of the Globe has Nature made an uninterrupted road, yea distinctly two such roads, for the great migration of races, not merely encouraging but almost forcing it, partly enticing and partly driving by instinct the Aryans to their true destiny. We have aleady called Europe a

derived world, derived from the East in blood, culture and institutions; such derivation resulted from the possibility of extensive and repeated migrations, which are kept up through European History.

The migratory spirit will not be confined to the land. It masters the Sea and then rises to the mastery of the Ocean. America therein is different from Europe, though both are derived; America is the product of an Oceanic civilization, which succeeds the Mediterranean.

In a brief summary we can best look at these four hemispherical divisions of the globe.

(1) *East-Northern*—Embracing Asia and Europe with uninterrupted land from Behring's Straits to the Straits of Gibraltar.

(2) *West-Northern*—Embracing North America and islands with separating Oceans on either side.

(3) *West-Southern*—South America and many islands.

(4) *East-Southern*—Africa and Asia south of the Equator including islands.

These last two quarters are now being filled up by a new migration from North to South, distinct from the previous one from East to West. In this way there can be no circummigration, since Nature forbids or has hitherto forbidden it, on account of climate and vast tracts of water and ice. That is, man circummigrates latitudinally,

not longitudinally. At least the Aryans have done so, impelled seemingly by their racial instinct.

Thus only one quarter of the globe, the East-Northern, was able to furnish the territorial condition of a race's circummigration. The movement in Asia seems to have been by land; but when Europe is attained with its Mediterranean, a discipline through the Sea begins to weave itself in the line of circummigrating peoples, till the Ocean is reached, which brings a new and hardier training. The Aryan Folk-Soul must continue its career westward and cross the Atlantic, after it has been trained by the Mediterranean, fulfilling therein its deepest racial instinct. Its circummigration embraces first a land-movement out of Asia to the sea; then a sea-movement through Europe to the ocean; then an ocean-movement out of Europe to America.

III.

We have next to take note that this march of the World's History to the West does not simply follow on straight lines but also deflects, showing the tendency to turn back upon itself and to form a cycle or inscribe a circle within Europe. Already we have observed how the movement of Civilization makes the European circuit from ancient Greece to modern Russia

(p. 13), swirling around the Alpine center along the watery circumference on the South, West and North. The smallness and territorial conformation of Europe, compared to Asia, permit, or perchance force it to be encircled in the way mentioned. So we may say that Civilization circummigrates Europe, going from one of its peoples to another, and taking some twenty-five centuries for its circuitous task.

The territorial surface of Europe culminates in a lofty chain of mountains, the Alps, which may be deemed the center whence the physical continent expands in all directions. Switzerland seems the common point from which all European lands radiate, with the exception of their Eastern part. Three great rivers having their sources in the Alps, suggest this outward movement from a center: the Rhone flowing southward, the Rhine flowing northward and the Danube flowing eastward. From the middle mountains there is a declivity on every side to the seas. At least such is the general aspect though there be exceptions. Thus Europe, taken by itself, seems the product of some mighty explosion of Nature, scattering the soil to the four winds. Really such has been the case, not however by a sudden convulsion, but by the slow attrition of time.

The Alps show, in correspondence with their physical character, a peculiar centralizing, or

looked at conversely, a raying-out of different peoples who speak the different tongues of Europe. On one side is French, on another to the South is Italian, on still another Romanese; all these children of Latin are counterbalanced by the German more to the North. Roman and Teuton have here met in a center and nationally coalesced. Even the great religious division of Europe into Catholic and Protestant reaches up into this Alpine land, with the two sides nearly equal, but living patriotically together in one State. We may think in this connection of the Medieval Swiss pikemen descending from their mountains in serried batallions with pointed weapons bristling against their foes in every direction.

The Alpine heights should, therefore, be placed at the intersection of the two lines running East and West as well as North and South, and thereby dividing Europe. This division we may carry out more fully. Southern Europe is Mediterranean, and was the home of ancient civilization, that of the Greek and Latin stocks. Northern Europe is Oceanic, being the home of the modern type of culture and religion, which has been mainly the work of the Teutonic stock, though the Slavic also has come upon the stage. The turn of European civilization from the South to the North, though long preparing, took place decisively at the Renascence, and was brought

about mainly by the deep religious transformation of the time. During this same period we may note the grand bifurcation of the European stream at its turning-point: the one branch of it sweeps outward over the Ocean by navigation to the extra-European world, partly new-discovered in the West and partly re-discovered in the East. But the other branch, the Northern, of Europe's progress, whirls about and pushes Eastward, in the direction opposite to the old Mediterranean movement, and thereby completes the European territorial cycle by coming around to the beginning, to the entrance from Asia. Thus we grasp the South-European and North-European movements as symmetrical counterparts making the great entirety of Europe's total round of Civilization. Such is, then, our first territorial fact and its general meaning.

Passing to the second partition of Europe as a whole, that moving from West to East, we shall have to divide the same into three parts in order to meet the requirements of History. The first will be the Western, embracing the Atlantic States with two large peninsulas as extremes and a large island between; the second will be the Middle division including Italy on the South and Germany on the North; the third is the Eastern division occupied by the Slavic stock principally and extending from Russia down into the Greek peninsula. From this point of view we shall

often have to deal with three Europes—Western, Middle and Eastern. Each of these divisions we shall find to have a certain character of its own, and a peculiar historic development when taken by itself as well as in connection with the other divisions. For instance Italy and Germany, though opposites spatially and spiritually, were interlinked in a strong bond during the Medieval time by the Empire and the Papacy, and the connection is still mantained under a new political order in our own day. Into these divisions and along with them plays the separative character and policy of the various European States.

Regarding these matters in a general way, we have to affirm that Europe is distinctively the continent of division, separation, dualism — physically, morally and intellectually. Asia and America are not without the same characteristic, yet it is not so deeply inherent, not so thoroughly prevailing. Such indeed we may deem Europe's function in mankind's complete psychical development: she represents the second stage, the separative, though she too has her unities. A look at the map will show that Europe's political units assert separation, while America's political units (in the United States) even in and through their separation assert unity.

Summarizing the movements of the Ethnic Protoplasm of Europe, we observe two different migrations from two different directions: the

first from East to West alongthe Mediterranean, the second from North to South down from the Alpine central line of mountains. The latter migration is of a barbarous folk impinging upon one which is civilized. For instance we hear of Celtic invasions into Italy early in the history of Rome, and later come the Teutonic invasions lasting many centuries; in fact the Austrian has been driven out of Italy only in our own day.

But from these inner and partial migrations of the peoples of Europe, we must rise to a view of its circummigration, which embraces the cycle of its History till the present time, moving in general along the peripheral border of its seas, and circling around its mountainous backbone stretched through its center, until the historic movement progresses back to its beginning. So we are to see civilized Europe circummigrating within itself, while at the same time it shares in and pushes forward the circummigration of the globe.

IV.

Civilization, then, within Europe circummigrates, going the European round of so much Space in so much Time. Next we are to consider the fact that this circummigration has proceeded by stages in which the civilized peoples are separated by a distinct line from the uncivilized peoples, whom the former have to

conquer and take up into themselves, assimilating and thereby civilizing the same. Thus the total Ethnic Protoplasm of Europe divides within itself into two sides, the civilized and the uncivilized; the dividing-line between them, which we shall find to be a continually moving one, may be called the Rim of Civilization.

Accordingly the movement of European Civilization is the perennial transcending of a limit, border, or the aforesaid Rim, which is pushed farther and farther till it embraces the whole of Europe. We have already noticed the line between East and West, or between Orient and Europe, along which and over which the primary conflicts of History take place. But the secondary conflicts (so we may call them for the present) inside of Europe have also had their border or Rim which is to be designated. Or rather we find a number of successive Rims between civilized and barbarous peoples ever widening out till the last corner is occupied. Four such Rims in the circummigrating Civilization of Europe we shall distinctly mark down, though each of them had its fluctuations forward and backward.

(1) First, there is the Greek Rim of Civilization which, expanding from continental Hellas as a center, threw out colonies to the East, West, North and South, these being outposts of Hellenism in Barbary. By the conquests of Alex-

ander this Rim was brought to include Western Asia and Egypt. In the old Greek Historian, Herodotus, we find it already outlined with such precision that it is seen to be an element of national consciousness. Hellas planted the coast of the Mediterranean with colonies, and sent a few to the Black Sea; but there was no attempt as a rule to subjugate the neigboring barbarians, with whom there was often a brisk commerce. The Greeks were not strictly a conquering people like the Romans; the spirit of their cities was that of autonomy for each and all. When Athens and Sparta became imperial and ruled other cities, they contradicted the national Folk-Soul, and also their own. Says Queen Tomyris to King Cyrus who tried to subjugate her people: "You rule over your dominions, and bear to see me rule over mine." She voiced really the Greek view against the Oriental conqueror.

(2) The Romans had also their Rim which, starting from their central city, was extended till it embraced the whole Mediterranean world. Rome was a conqueror and therein different from Greece. It subjugated the backward tribes of Italy, whom the Greek deemed barbarians, and civilized them through its law and institutions. Thus the Roman Rim was pushed out far beyond the Grecian. Still it took in only a part of Barbary, for instance the Celts of the North but not the Teutons, who were never Romanized in their

own seats. The Roman Empire, when at its greatest extent, had an African, Asiatic, and European Rim which it did not, and indeed could not, permanently transcend. Christianity, however, with its missionary spirit in religion transcended it during Roman times, and converted the barbarians.

(3) The great fact about Charlemagne is that he ran a new Rim in Europe, having conquered the Germans of the North, and made them Christians. Also some Slavic peoples he subjected, and thus reached out to Eastern Europe. It may be said that with Charlemagne the European consciousness begins to dawn. The feeling that Europe is one at least starts; with this also goes the feeling that it must be Christian. The Crusades, as the movement of most of the European peoples, intensified this feeling. Still there was a borderland of North-Western Europe which was outside the pale, was heathen, savage, hostile. The Teutonic Knights held and pushed forward this Rim for several centuries. In general we may call this the Teutonic Rim as distinct from the Roman Rim, which did not embrace Teutonia.

(4) When Russia drives out her Tartar lords, the European Rim may be said to be definitely realized as distinct from Asia. This took place about the beginning of the Renascence, or of modern Europe (1400-1500). With Peter the

Great, Russia distinctly commences to turn westward for her political affiliation and seeks the society of European Nations, in whose process she will participate as a leading member.

European History, accordingly, moves more and more into unity by eliminating its inner Rims. This unity reposes ultimately upon one race, the Aryan, and upon one religion, the Christian. To be sure there is in this regard a discordant note: the Turk of alien race and religion pushed across the European Rim into the Greek (or Balkan) peninsula, and has mantained himself there over four centuries and a half, having taken possession of the original seat of Western Civilization.

So it comes that Europe of the Twentieth Century feels herself tightly hooped up like a hogshead, and seeks an outlet for her ever-increasing and fermenting contents. On all sides she is overflowing the Rim into other lands, particularly into Africa, yet also into Asia. That is, European States migrate, sending out offshoots of themselves and establishing provinces. But to America Europeans migrate singly, the individual takes the initiative, not the State, and uses his own Will for selecting his spot of Earth, and making his career. That is partially a result of the Monroe doctrine; it causes a kind of Natural Selection, and calls forth the individuality of the

emigrant. Still such an individual migration is a result also of the spirit of the time, and is really determined by the political character of the country as the goal toward which the man is moving.

In general it may be said to have been the historic function of the Medieval Period to develop and make explicit the European consciousness, the self-awareness of Europe as a unit. The Greco-Roman world had no such consciousness, at least not developed; implicit indeed it was, for we find the name of Europe accounted for already in Greek Mythology, and speculated upon by the Father of History, who, however, expressly declares that its limits were unknown. Christianity, with its missionary work to the European heathen of the North, converts them to one faith, to one divinity and one book, thus unifying the whole of Europe in and through religion, whereby it becomes conscious of its one Self in becoming conscious of its one God. Strangely, it was not fully conscious of its racial unity till it heard the message of Comparative Philology in the Nineteenth Century. Yet the racial unity reaches far back of Christianity, being brought by the Aryans from their original home in Asia. Politically medievalism was separative, it divided up the one Roman Empire into many Nation-States, thereby restoring to the world nationality, which had

been submerged in Rome. Religiously it united and held together these centrifugal Nation-States by a strong hand, which, even if external largely, was necessary. Such is the contrast between the Greco-Roman and Medieval Periods: the one had political union with little religious union; the other had religious union with little political union. It was this religious oneness which made the German, the Italian and even the Russian conscious of being European as distinct from Asiatic. Previously it was Greece or Rome versus Asia.

The four preceding Rims were territorial, drawn on land, and hovering more or less about a definite line. But when the last Rim, which includes all Europe, is completely delimited and recognized, the marine boundary, which deflected all four Rims and determined them from the outside, is in its turn transcended, and Europe at the Renascence begins to move outside of itself, to an extra-European world. Each leading European Nation-State of that time bursts the Oceanic barrier and sweeps outward, planting itself in colonies on distant shores. With this movement along with others, the Medieval Period comes to an end, since the Church no longer exercises a dominant influence over the Nation-State, which now is acting for itself in a new order. Europe is circummigrated and the Ethnic Protoplasm is pretty well used up.

We may note here that international Law is distinctly getting control of the society of European Nation-States, which are thus bringing their relations to one another under a fixed Law. This is what is supplanting the secular authority of the Pope, who assumed a certain Power over war and peace between these Nation-States. A book written by a Hollander, Hugo Grotius (published at Paris in 1625), set forth the Rights of Peace and War among Nations, and organized a system of international Jurisprudence for the better association of European peoples, who were to judge of and to apply this Law. Moreover he sharply distinguishes Natural Law from Positive or Enacted Law, bringing it back to the individual. He goes so far as to say that subjects are not bound to serve in a war which they think unjust. And he holds that the hangman before executing a sentence should satisfy himself of its rightness — which makes him judge of the judge.

Returning to the main topic we are to grasp together the four Rims herein outlined, observing that they are so many stages in the grand circummigration of European History, as it proceeds to call up State after State, till the society of the States of Europe is consummated in the Polyarchy of to-day. The Aryan race has therein Europeanized itself politically, by degrees bringing its barbarous Ethnic Protoplasm into the pale

of Civilization, of which process the preceding are the four prime stages. In fact, these stages may be named after the four chief historic stocks of the European Aryans. That is, the four Rims may be labelled successively the Greek, the Roman, the Teutonic, and Slavic, the latter completing the total Rim of Europe which has now surrounded and fenced-in nationally, even if it has not yet fully elaborated and civilized, its Ethnic Protoplasm.

It should be noted, however, that there is still the Rim of Barbarism on our globe, even if Europe has substantially pushed it outside of her borders, and made it, as far as she is concerned extra-European. The estimate has been given that not more than one-half of the Earth's population may be deemed civilized. If this be so, then some seven or eight hundred millions of the Ethnic Protoplasm of the total Globe still remain to be taken up and assimilated (or destroyed) by civilization. Moreover this Ethnic Protoplasm is no longer uniracial, as in Europe alone, but is multiracial, non-Aryan, even non-white: in view of which fact we must suppose that civilization itself will become multiracial, and perchance, like Joseph's coat, of many colors.

V.

We have followed the circummigration of the civilized European States within Europe, till

they become a society of many political members, which, though separate and independent, have a certain inner oneness, a spirit in common which makes them distinct from Asia or America. This is what we must now briefly emphasize by giving a special name to it—we shall call it the European Folk-Soul, which even if separative and Polyarchic, has still its unitary principle also.

Europe is, therefore, a community composed indeed of many commonwealths, each having its own political character, purpose, and form of government, yet all having a common character and partaking of a common consciousness. Europe is an organism having one body with numerous members, but likewise having a soul, which has animated and still animates its organism from the beginning. Now it is this soul of Europe to which we have to penetrate in her History; this is what we have just designated as the European Folk-Soul. At the same time we are not to forget that each people of the European Society of Nations has its own Folk-Soul, of which too we shall have to say somewhat. In fact there has been a succession of Folk-Souls through the Ages; in antiquity we observe three main ones, Greek, Roman, Imperial, which are followed by the Medieval and Modern.

European History has to reveal the develop-

ment of the European Folk-Soul into its present condition, which, as already indicated is now straining its bounds, seeking to break over them and to become extra-European. This seems to be the birth-throe of a great epoch, which had previously given some signs at the Renascence. Each European Nation-State, having received an imperial heritage of the spirit from Rome, and being determined from within politically and religiously, goes forth to the backward races of other continents and starts to colonize, that is to Europeanize them. Undoubtedly this movement is old, Hellas sought to Hellenize and Rome to Romanize the world. True to its inherited character the European Folk-Soul seeks to Europeanize the world. It does this however, not through one people or nation, as was the case in antiquity, but through a society of many nations, each of which goes forth independently and does its part, gets its share of land and makes provinces as did Rome, when she began her world-historical career. Thus Europe with its group of Nation-States is an association of several Romes, each of which is getting to have a number of extra-European provinces.

Still these imperial Nation-States have at the same time their intra-European process with one another, more lively and varied than ever. New States are continually added to the society inside of Europe; recently what are known as the Balk-

an States have arisen. Then each of these Nation-States has its own national process, and this also must be recorded in History, which is certainly becoming complex. Moreover in this society of independent commonwealths, a new division of importance rises: some are strongest of all, some are stronger than others; so the distinction between the Great Powers and the Lesser comes decidedly into the foreground.

In general, we may draw from the preceding account that the European Folk-Soul as a whole has shown itself not only migratory but circummigratory in Europe, having completed itself in completing the round of European States. Thus the old Aryan instinct of surrounding the globe has received a new development and confirmation in the work of its offspring, the European Folk-Soul. This, however, is a link — the most important one, and yet but a link — in the vaster chain of circummigration, which carries with it the movement of the World's History.

And now, having ascertained the spatial circummigratory character of European History, its circular sweeps in Space, we pass to look at its circular sweeps in Time, which are the measuring principle of historic events, and which mark off in a succession of self-returning cycles (therein resembling the year or the day) what the Folk-Soul goes through outwardly

and inwardly by way of experience. Such a cycle of Time is known in History by the name of the Period, literally meaning the Way round, which suggests its cyclical character. Thus we come to consider the very important historic principle of Periodicity, which is the temporal counterpart and complement of spatial Circum-migration.

Section Fourth.

Periodicity.

To periodize History is to organize it, is to transform it from chaos into cosmos. Only thus can its processes be seen, great and small. From the earliest historian till the present time there has always been some attempt to find the historic Period, as the underlying principle of the world's occurrences. The development as well as the depth of the appreciation of History may be measured by the getting of its true Periods. These undoubtedly become in their general outlines more pronounced as Time unfolds its events, whose vast number and complexity, however, render their special ordering more difficult. The periodic character of History is its deepest note, and must be taken as its fundamental principle of organization.

The migratory movement of the World's History we have just seen streaming westward on its main line, from Asia through Europe to America. Such have been its great territorial stages which, however, have had a corresponding spiritual significance. We have already observed the one race (Aryan) moving from the Orient into Europe, where it becomes historical and divides itself into many States. Thus the Oriental unit

(in race, speech, institutions) particularizes itself, and remains separated into particular States throughout European History. Still there is that original unity — racial, linguistic, institutional — underlying its political diversity. But History so far shows Europe unable to cement its national parts into a governmental whole, unable to realize its racial unity in one State. And yet such a political unity is its great historic end, the goal toward which it is moving, the complete process of which it is but a stage. The History of Europe, therefore lies between two unities, one before and one after, evolving out of the first and into the second. From this point of view it is the middle stage in the total movement of the World's History.

We may again cast a glance at the Oriental source which has several races in it, with their Ethnic Protoplasm always unfolding toward particular States. But the one supreme Asiatic State puts down the rising particularity from the outside by the strong hand of power. One of its races, however, moves into Europe where it evolves just the system of particular States (Polyarchy) as its principle. Here is the deepest point of political antagonism between the Orient and Europe; the latter unfolds and cherishes the principle which the former puts down as its opposite. Hence Asia will precipitate itself upon Europe in deepest hostility of principle through-

out the course of European History, which fact gives rise to its leading epochs.

I.

The political consciousness of the Orient we must pry into, if we would understand Europe, and even America. The Asiatic has a State and its end is to secure freedom, that is, his conception of freedom. Now it may be said that this freedom of his turns on giving up individual freedom. His will is that the ruler's will be done absolutely; any limitation upon the latter's will limits his own and destroys what he conceives to be his freedom. The Orientals say in substance to their Monarch as to their God: My Will is that thy Will be done. Thus there is in the Orient no separation between the religious and secular Institutions, almost no separation between King and God; certainly the King speaks with the voice of the God. Moreover the voice of the ruler is the voice of the State and its decrees; there is as yet no abiding distinction between his personal caprice and the universal law. Still we have to say that the Oriental State existed in order to actualize freedom, even if the Oriental man deemed his freedom as institutional to be a total subservience to the ruler's freedom as autocratic and arbitrary. He could

not yet fully distinguish himself as Will from the single Will of the ruler; his consciousness was one with his King and his God. As the ruler's Will was one with divinity, so the subject's Will was one with the ruler, and through the latter with divinity. In a general way this spirit gives the theocratic State which we find in the Orient.

Now Europe will make here a sharp distinction. It proceeds to separate the political and the religious Institution already in Greece and Rome, while the conflicts between the two authorities, Empire and Papacy, fill the Middle Ages. In fact to-day Europe is still writhing in the strife between Church and State. Deep is the European dualism between these two Institutions, which are so naturally united in the Orient. Moreover the European ruler of the State has to distinguish between his Self as particular or caprice and his Self as universal or law. The peoples of Europe have made States whose rulers enact good laws, free of arbitrariness; still the source of the good law is thus arbitrary. Not simply the law must be universal, bnt also the law-making. All must finally make the law who obey the law. Not any individual as Monarch, or any privileged class of individuals is to make the law, or to stand in the way of its being made by all who are to obey it. Justice must not only be given to the people, as it were

from above (Asia) or from the outside (Europe), but the people themselves to themselves must give justice (America). To give the good is certainly as valuable and needful a boon to man and to all men as to receive the good.

Such we may deem the stages of consciousness in the three continents as regards the source of the law, which is to govern man in the State: it is God-made (Orient), it is People-made (Occident), it is made by one privileged man or by some men or even by many (Europe). Since History moves through the State, we have to take into account the State's essence, which is its law securing and actualizing human freedom.

We may look at this matter also from the standpoint of obedience to law. For our purpose we can designate two classes: law-makers and law-obeyers. As long as the law-makers are distinct from the people as law-obeyers, there is privilege, which limits the universality of the law. Such a law-maker often shows the tendency to exempt himself from his own law made for other folks. Not till the law-obeyers as a whole make the law which they obey, is their freedom secured and truly actualized, being endowed with a complete duty on the one hand and being themselves accountable on the other. In the Orient, however, the law-obeyer takes the law as God-sent, even if it is proclaimed through the sovereign or through the

law-giver (Moses); he never thinks of asking to participate in its making, or to hold its maker accountable, unless a pretender or false prophet. But in Europe the conflict between the two, the law-maker and the law-obeyer, opens, the latter seeking more and more to be law-maker also, and thus to obey the law which he makes and to do away with the privileged law-maker. But Europe has or has had law-makers by birth (king and nobles) who at least take part in legislation, and, whose law must be obeyed by those who had no hand in making it. An external arbitrary element still remains in European law, even when it is just. Such a law may bring justice to men from the outside, but men must through the law bring justice to themselves. The law in Europe makes man's right real with one fundamental exception: it does not make real man's right to make itself (the law). Justice is not complete, is not universal, when it gives to everybody his own (*suum cuique*), without giving him at the same his own self-made justice, of course through the organization of the State. I have not my highest right, the right of freedom, when such right is determined by another, and even justly determined. Such is, in general, the Occidental principle, which solves the European conflict between law-makers and law-obeyers. Self-government means that by law men make the law

which they obey, and they obey the law which they make.

Thus Orient, Europe and Occident all have the law, and the law is made for the people who have to obey it; but the grand historic difference between these continents lies in the degrees through which the people pass from being merely law-obeyers to being also law-makers.

II.

Two supreme Periods of the World's History are formed by Asia and by Europe, each having also its own inner historic development. The largest and smallest of the grand divisions of the globe are not only placed alongside of each other, but the one flows out of the other territorially and spiritually. Great and suggestive are the contrasts between largest Asia and smallest Europe; the one seems to expand externally, spaceward; the other seems to contract internally toward a point, or timeward; thus they appear to stand in a primordial elemental relation, as if to Space and Time. Moreover the transition from one to the other for the mind has something absolute in it; it is as if the universal Ego were revealing on our globe two stages of his process, thus imaging in outer terrestrial shapes the movement of the All. History takes on its mightiest appearance in the Oriental and European manifestations of itself and their in-

teraction. What we call the Pampsychosis is herein realizing itself historically on its grandest scale, and unseals and expresses its own inner self-separation in these two supreme stages of the World's History, Orient and Europe.

Another fact about Asia we should note: its potential nature. It is the land of all possibilities, many of them being as yet undeveloped. It has several races, all of them doubtless capable of civilization. But Europe has unfolded only one of these Asiatic races and also only one Asiatic language, and one Asiatic religion. Thus we have to deem Asia as a vast seething cauldron of potentialities in race, speech, religion. Observe again with soul-stretching glances into futurity: in Europe and also in America Asia has evolved but one of its possibilities, having in its bosom others as yet unevolved. Are they too destined to unfold through the countless coming æons into new civilizations, parallel with or perchance successive to our Aryan and Christian? So much for the vast outlook upon Asiatic potentialities, indicating the important fact for periodizing our present History, that Asia represents its first implicit, potential Period.

Looking at Asia by itself we may expand some of the foregoing points. As a whole it impresses mightily by its overwhelming spatial character, possessing a greater exten-

sion than any other continental division of the globe, embracing as much surface as all the Americas. Its striking divisions are spatial and threefold — Eastern, Central and Western. Time with its movement seems to have much less meaning to Asia than Space with its extension. On the other hand Europe is the least of all the continental divisions spatially; its soul is intensive more than extensive, and puts great stress upon moving Time and its divisions rather than upon moveless Space continuously lying alongside of itself in a kind of sempiternal sameness. Hence it comes that History in the East is less developed than in Europe, has less significance, is less certain of itself, and is much less cultivated. Egypt lay in large masses of indistinguishable Time till the Greek came and began to chronologize it. India has made a marvelous advance in historic consciousness since the British came. Indeed Asia is just getting historicized through Europe with the latter's dates, calendars, and eras, in general through the European organization of Time, of which Asia has shown itself not wholly incapable yet relatively behind hand. The Asiatic mind is dominantly spatial and in Space; the European mind is dominantly temporal and in Time; the one is more stable and religious, the other more scientific and questioning. Yet we shall find that neither side is wholly devoid of the other's elemental nature.

Here we may affirm again that the round of conflict between West-Asia and Europe brings forth the deepest periodic movements of European History.

It has been already stated that Asia is the home of Races. Each of its three parts, East, Middle and West, shows racial diversity. If there ever was an original separation of the one humanity into a multiplicity of Races — which we can conceive, though hardly prove — it is most likely to have taken place in Asia. But what concerns us at present is that Asia, and specially West-Asia with which Europe unfolds in its supreme historic process, is multiracial, a perpetually fermenting vat of racial differences and antagonisms — Aryan, Semitic, Turanian. On the other hand Europe is mainly uniracial, as well as unilingual and unireligious. Here lies the deep opposition between Asia and Europe, source of the original native dualism in European History, which separating from its Oriental mother, becomes separative within itself by its very birth.

Of the three Asias just designated, West-Asia has always turned her historic face toward Europe, and the West, not so much toward India and the farther East. It evidently regards Europe as its other half or its other self, which it must win in order to be whole. Europe on its its side has turned her historic face toward West-

Asia in her supreme conjunctures. From this fact her History derives its chief Periods, and thus we pass from the periodicity of the World's History (Oriental, European, Occidental) to the periodicity of European History, which we shall find to be divided into Ancient, Medieval and Modern.

III.

The fact just mentioned we shall emphasize by unfolding it a little. Passing from the World's History to one of its stages, namely European History we wish to grasp the periodizing of it, in which various methods may be employed, though they bring forth one result. First there is the outer clash with West Asia, already mentioned, which stirs Europe to its depths and gives rise, at least externally, to its three chief historic Periods — Ancient, Medieval and Modern. This division of European History has been very generally seen and acknowledged, but it appears to have been picked up empirically, while the grounds of it have not been much studied, or even asked after.

So we are now to consider the fact that the deepest phases of European History spring from the interaction between East and West, from the impact now coming out of Asia upon Europe, now out of Europe upon Asia. Really this is what forms the historic cycles or periods of

European History, which is primarily determined by the conflict between the aforesaid two continents or their ideas. It is, therefore, necessary that we get to know, at least in a general way, these two colliding ideas, the European and the Asiatic.

The History of Asia, specially Western Asia, shows a succession of Empires, often of great extent, but usually leaving little or no permanent impress upon the conquered peoples, who are compelled to pay a tax in men and property to their conqueror, but who are left as before in their language, culture, civilization, religion and communal institutions. That is, they are not as a rule, assimilated to their victors, wherein lies a chief difference between the Oriental and the Roman Empires.

One may well ask: What is the historic purpose of such an Oriental despotism? It is at least the severe discipline of obedience for the conquered individual, city, tribe, nation; even slavery has its training out of caprice. One can also see an effort, on the part of the Persian empire for instance, to protect the peoples united under its sway against the sudden invasion of barbarous hordes of the North, like the Cimmerians anciently and like the Tartars in the Medieval time. Cyrus met his death, it would seem, in trying to subdue one of these savage hordes; and Darius made an expedition against

the tribes of those steppes (the *vagina gentium*), and failed like Napoleon in the same regions. This then was a limit drawn in the North against the ancient Persian Empire, which limit it could not transcend.

There have been three of these West-Asiatic attacks upon Europe in the course of her History: first is the Persian, which opens distinctly historical Antiquity; second is the Arabian, which starts the Middle Ages; third is the Turk, who takes Constantinople about the beginning of the Modern Era. Each of these assaults is desperately offensive in its character, bent on the possession of the fair heritage of Europe, which at first acting on the defensive against the mighty mass of human waves threatening to deluge it and its culture, has slowly gained the strength not only to repel the blows, but to take the offensive in its turn and invade Asia, there founding Empires. This action and reaction between the two sides must be alternately considered as one movement rounding itself out to completeness, as one cycle or period of European History, of which there have been in the large sense three since its dawn. Moreover each of these three great Oriental invasions has been the task of a different race; the Aryan, the Semite, and the Turanian (or Tartar) has each in turn precipitated himself upon Europe, and these

attacks have been in their main events about a thousand years apart.

It is evident that all these desperate conflicts have a racial substrate. The first shows the Aryan race dividing within itself into its two supreme divisions, the Asiatic and European—a scission whose germ probably lies far back in the original separation of this same race upon the highlands of Central Asia, one part turning eastward toward India, the other turning westward toward Iran and Anatolia. Still both these parts remained Oriental till the grand crossing into Europe where the deepest and most permanent and altogether the most important racial separation takes place. This inner Aryan conflict between Orient and Europe was that of Greek and Roman antiquity, in which the other non-Aryan races of Western Asia had as yet relatively little historic prominence. But after the ancient classic world has made its cycle, the Semitic Arab breaks suddenly into History and into Europe, and begins a new epoch. This also runs its course, when the Turanian Turk appears.

Along with this racial substrate there is commingled a religious element in each case. We read that in the first great invasion of Greece the Persian army of Xerxes burned the temples and violated the sanctuaries of the Gods, which fact we couple with the zealous Zoroastrian-

ism of the Persians of this age and the preceding, after they had put down the Magian revolution. (See Herodotus Book III, with Rawlinson's comments). Still the religious intensity of Asia is manifested far more decidedly in the second great invasion of Greece and of its Byzantine world by the Arabians fired with their new religion of Mahomet. When this race had been successfully repelled and was declining, the same religion was taken up by a new race with new zeal, and the third great invasion of Greece by the Orientals (the Turks) made them masters of that coveted land after a conflict lasting more than two thousand years.

With the foregoing racial and religious antagonism is conjoined the collision between the Social Institutions of the Orient and Europe. The Family in the East was and still is polygamous, while that of the West is monogamous. Thus the primal Institution of man undergoes the greatest kind of a change, which transforms the entire fabric of European Society, and makes it fundamentally distinct from that of the Orient. Particularly the woman becomes a different being and will give birth to different men. The political Institution shows a change equally great. In the East the individual has no share, certainly no direct share, in making the law which he obeys, or in determining the realm of authority which determines him.

But in Europe the individual, or we may say the people, begins to be political, to participate in the State which it has to maintain. As already set forth, the Orient is autocratic, yea theocratic; the ruler is regarded as supreme as God, whose incarnation or at least whose vicegerent he is, or claims to be. Such a government is the product of the consciousness of the Oriental man; we have to think it as his creation ultimately, not foisted upon him from the outside against his will, but the true evolution of his will, in which he actualizes his conception of freedom.

Such, then, is in general the first or outer origin of the periodicity of European History. We have to mark it as coming from the outside, in this case as in so many others the East goes West and starts the latter's activity, yea self-activity. That is, West-Asia periodizes Europe, or rather makes it perodize itself. Through the three grand attacks of the three Asiatic races and religions and institutions, Europe is moved in her profoundest abysses, not only to make a counter attack against the Orient, but also to have a corresponding inner movement of her own. This is what we shall study next, since it too reveals in its own way the Periods of European History.

IV.

The inner movement of Europe's historic periodicity turns upon the kinds of government, or the political forms in which and through which European History develops. The Periods will be just the same as before, but they are now to be seen as Europe's own process also, and not merely as the result of the outer assault from Asia. In other words Europe is moved externally to assert itself internally, or is determined (outside) to determine itself (inside). Therein we may trace a striking analogy to Mind, Self, Ego, which is likewise stimulated by the outer world to inner movement and re-action.

We have indicated on a previous page that the political principle of the Orient was the suppression of the particular State, and its subordination to a vast Empire. This is what brings it primarily into conflict with the political principle of Europe, which asserts the primacy of the particular State. Hence Europe was at the start of History and is to-day a group or cluster of particular States. Here we speak of dominant tendencies, to which there are exceptions on both sides. Undoubtedly the Oriental Empire often breaks up into political fragments, but the dominant tendency is toward unification; on the other hand some European States (never all) have been unified under one government, but

even in this case the dominant tendency soon veers again toward separation. Now Asia or specially West-Asia, seeking as it must to make its principle universal, or to realize the State universal, is thrust against Europe primarily, which has just the opposite political principle. Herein too we may see the reason why West-Asia does not so readily turn to the East, to India and China, which politically resemble it, but to the West, to Europe which is its political opposite, and which is thereby driven to maintain and unfold its own principle of the particular State. Indeed we shall find that Europe, when assailed from the East, will unite to assert itself as separative, as seen in the ancient Greco-Persian war. Such a union, however, is but temporary, being for a temporary purpose. Accordingly we are now to see Europe unfolding by virtue of its own inner principle of the State particular, and priodizing itself as a society of separate autonomous commonwealths.

Already we have given to this pervasive element of European History the special name of Polyarchy, since the fact has risen to the surface before in other counections. But at present we are to observe it in a new part, that of Period-making. Let us recall then, that the History of Europe from its dawn till our own Twentieth Century, lies between two governmental forms: the old Greek City-State and the modern Nation-State. To this fact we must add

another: the first manifestation of the historic State in ancient Greece was that of a society or group of City-States; the last manifestation of the State in cotemporary Europe is likewise that of a society or group, but of Nation-States. We see that History moves between two societies of States, old and new, first and last. Thus modern Europe is a return (not a relapse) to ancient Hellas in certain very important political aspects. Hence Greek History has meant so much to Europe, especially since the Renascence.

Using the special terms already employed, we can say that European History is a movement between two Polyarchies, that this movement is an evolution of a society of particular States or or is Polyarchic, and that the Polyarchy up to date has been the persistent and pervasive fact of historic Europe. Hence the latter will be periodized in accord with this basic political principle of itself. Its three periods we shall look at in order.

(1) *Ancient.* This period of European History has the City-State as its political norm, which takes various shapes in Greece, Rome and Byzantium successively, the City-State moving from its Polyarchy to its Henarchy.

Also there is the evolution of the City-State out of the primordial Ethnic Protoplasm into the ancient Mediterranean civilization of Europe, which then returns to this Ethnic Protoplasm (chiefly Teutonic) for a fresh dip in its

first creative sources. This protoplasmic round from beginning back to beginning embraces the classic world, completing the latter and furnishing the start for a new Period of European History.

Along with this Aryan political development, later antiquity began weaving into the European Folk-Soul a new racial and religious strand derived from the two Semitic Bibles. Christianity, sprung of West-Asia, formed an inner bond of union between its Asiatic home and Europe till this bond was shivered by Mahomet at the opening of the Middle Ages.

(2) *Medieval.* This period of European History has what may be called the Ethnic State as its political norm, an ever-varying composite of the old Roman City-State and the barbarous Ethnic Protoplasm of North-European races, whose chief institution was the primitive Village Community (specially the Teutonic Mark). Note these two ultimate political elements, which constitute the original medieval political dualism, and which the Middle Ages are to fuse together into a new governmental form.

The one ancient Roman Empire, already dividing in antiquity, becomes separated into two Ethnic Empires, Aryan and Semitic, also into two religions, Christian and Mohammedan, with a corresponding separation in language and institutions. Then internally Europe divides into State and Church, the latter still further into

Eastern and Western, and this last again into Catholic and Protestant. Thus Medieval History shows itself deeply separative.

(3) *Modern.* This Period of European History has for its political norm the Nation-State as imperial, no longer merely as ethnic or tribal. The supreme tendency of the Medieval State was to transfer the Empire-City (Rome) to each and every Ethnic State of the barbarians, thus evolving the latter State through the former into the Empire Nation-State. So we behold the History of Europe returning to the Polyarchy, not indeed of old Greek City-States but of Empire Nation-States. This is contemporary Europe, which in the present Modern Period has been unfolding and gradually transforming into its States the primitive Ethnic Protoplasm, out of which European civilization arose in ancient Hellas, and which it has more and more absorbed till little or none is left. Hence the outlook is that Europe has territorially and perchance spiritually completed her round of civilization, or at least one round of it, and must now break out of her limits into other continents — which indeed she has been recently doing.

In this way we grasp in advance the total sweep of European History starting with the Greek Polyarchy of autonomous City-States, and, after some twenty-five centuries of development, concluding for the present in the European Polyarchy of Nation-States.

V.

This last stage of European History, the modern, we shall here expand a little since it touches and, as far as can now be seen, includes our own time. Note again that it is a return of man upon himself within and without, whereby he becomes more profoundly aware of himself (or of his Self) as well as of his historic Past. Politically we see him going back to his start in ancient Greece, yet he does not leave out the work of imperial Rome in his present form of government. Evidently this third or self-returning stage of European Periodicity is what reveals the latter, making it consciously present to man, and indeed suggesting to him the same process to be that of his own mind.

We have all heard that the Renascence or Revival of Learning was chiefly brought about by the renewal of Greek and Latin studies, by a return to and restoration of the classic world in the modern. It has been less observed that the European political system, evolving out of the Middle Ages, has also gone back to Greek antiquity in the fact of forming a society of autonomous and inter-acting States, among which the old idea of Hegemony also has not been wanting. Undoubtedly independent Nation-States were formed in the Medieval time, but they acknowledged a religious headship outside of themselves in papal Rome. The Reformation

smote this link, and most of the States of Northern or Teutonic Europe became self-centered religiously as well as politically, while the Latin States still adhered to the Roman ecclesiastical center. Thus Christian Europe became divided into two new sets of States: the completely self-centered both in Church and State, and the partially self-centered, those autonomous in State but not in Church.

This division between North and South, Teutonic and Latin, Protestant and Catholic led to bitter conflict between the two sides, of which the war between Spain and Holland in the Sixteenth Century is a sample. In the deepest sense it was a fight over the movement of civilization, of which the Northern self-centered States became the chief supporters. That spirit of Universal History, which had remained in the Mediterranean basin ever since civilized Europe started, was about to leave it and to pass to Northern peoples of a different speech and character. During two great Periods of History the Greco-Roman and Medieval, lasting over two thousand years, the World-Spirit had moved westward along the Midland Sea till it came to the Atlantic and the Oceanic States of the North, where it was to begin a new career.

Spain became for a time the bridge both physically and spiritually from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic. The same was true of France in a higher degree. The French territory connects

Sea and Ocean somewhat in the form of a bridge bordering in the South upon two great Latin peninsulas (Italy and Spain), and in the North upon Teutonic peoples. In the South France had been under Greek, Latin, and Arabic influences, Marseilles having been an early and influential Greek colony long before Rome appeared in its horizon. In the North, France was largely Teutonic, taking its name from a German tribe, the Franks. Still France remained, after much inner stuggle, Latin in religion as well as in speech and spirit, though she also maintained her inter-connecting or mediating character intellectually between the nations of Europe.

This fact is seen in the European use of the French tongue for intercommunication, it being the daughter and heir of the Latin, and in some respects the rival. French literature has shown an international power, especially it has made itself the interpreter of the linguistically separated peoples of Europe. Still in French there has been written no greatest masterpiece of literature, as is also the case in Latin; its power of exposition prevails over its originality. The French translation has been hitherto the literary vehicle to make Europe acquainted with itself, the same being true of conversation in French. European science, however, sought for a long time to express itself in Latin, and has not wholly

eschewed the habit. At present the literary supremacy of the French tongue is getting contested on the scientific side by German, on the commercial by English.

Since the rise of the society of modern Nation-States, attempts to consolidate them into an Empire like the Roman have not been wanting. Particularly has this ambition shown itself in the Latin States of the West, which find it hard to free themselves of the mighty tradition of imperial Rome. Charles V and his son, Philip II of Spain, Louis XIV and above all Napoleon of France, assailed the autonomous, Teutonic Nation-State, and were not only defeated but undone in the conflict.

Still the imperial principle has not been lost, but transformed. Instead of subjecting all States to its one rule, it has gone over into each Nation-State of Europe so that we call it a society of Empire Nation-States, each of which is at present moving outside of Europe for imperial sway. In fact it may be affirmed as an important truth in the conception of History, that no principle which the World-Spirit has brought forth and established for centuries, is ever lost afterwards. It becomes an element, transformed indeed, of the more advanced stage, in which it can always be discovered by a careful analysis. So the imperial principle is taken up into the modern Nation-State. And that is not the end of it by any means. The American Fed-

eral State has and always has had an imperial element, which must become more explicit if it is going to deal with backward peoples, and train them to self-government. Imperialism is not necessarily a reproach; if it were, History would be full of reproaches of itself, and we would do better to cast it at once into the abyss of oblivion.

In this Renascence or New Birth of itself, the modern world goes back to its childhood, in fact to its various kinds of childhood or origins, for the purpose of recovering and renewing its elemental energy before starting a fresh cycle of the World's History. We may here summarize the ways in which this grand act of European Periodicity manifests itself. First there is the return to Greece and Rome for their secular culture, for their art, literature, science. Then there is the political return to the Polyarchy. At the same time there is a religious return to the Semitic stream which starts in West-Asia, to the Christian and Hebrew sources of Europe's religion. Moreover the spatial round within Europe itself is completed. There is also an Asio-European return which includes Central and Farther Asia — which fact, however suggests also the beginning of a new and larger cycle in the World's History, into whose field total Asia, as distinct from the Western part of it, seems to be just entering, in connection with Europe. Thus the historic

Period shows an inner propulsion, a native bent as it were, to widen itself out till it may embrace the entire Globe.

But coming back to the Periodicity of European History, with its three stages, we may repeat that it has been unfolded and most strikingly brought to consciousness by the Renascence, especially by the political organization of the latter — the Polyarchy. This has been indeed strongly realized and confirmed; but the question will arise, whether or not it is the ultimate historic form of Europe's States. Or is it but one cycle, perchance not complete? America in its leading government rejects the Polyarchy, evidently transcending the same and adopting the federation of Constitutional States, as distinct from the European society of City-States or of Nation-States. Thus seems to rise beyond Europe, yet really out of her bosom, the third stage of the total World's History, which we have named the Occidental. And still even beyond this third stage, or perchance in connection with it, something is stirring in our own day and has given a glimpse of itself which compels a new outlook into the historic future and its Periodicity. A great event has just happened which has set us all to thinking and to drawing fresh lines on and even around the globe. Of this event, flashing gigantesque through dim consequences afar upon futurity, we must take a brief note.

Section Fifth.

Outlook.

Japan at the present time appears to be the pivot of a new World's History, or at least of a new stage or period of world-historical development. The civilized nations saw an Oriental Power suddenly arise and assert itself very emphatically in the Chinese-Japanese war of 1894 over Corea. The European navy and army, supposed to be the peculiar implements of the white man who originated them, were appropriated and wielded by the yellow man with a skill and energy which equalled, and possibly surpassed, the highest standards of Europe. Is this a similar instance to that of the old Teutons who acquired the discipline and obtained the weapons of the Roman army, and then directed them with destructive might against Rome herself? Thus Europe, turning back upon her own history and reflecting upon her conduct in the past, could not help querying with much meditation and some anxiety. Russia, France and Germany proceeded to compel Japan, after she had won brilliant victories and occupied Port Arthur and Liaotung, to leave the main land, and then each of these European nations took for itself a Chinese slice. England too

must have a share to protect her interests, and gets the important strategic point opposite Port Arthur (Wei-hai-Wei). Such was the beginning of the partition of China, the yellow man's chief terrestrial abode, among the leading European Powers. This was indeed the Mongolian Orient, but all Asia, not partitioned already, felt itself threatened. China's vain and foolish attempt to get rid of the foreigner came to naught in the Boxer rebellion (1899). Russia, having gotten Port Arthur and its territory, built the Siberian railway to hold Manchuria, and to dominate China and the East, the only obstruction being seemingly the jealousy of the other European nations.

And now comes the shock which not only prostrates Russia, the Colossus of the North, but makes all Europe quake and reel back upon herself; in fact the whole civilized world feels the concussion of the war between Japan and Russia (1904), which is properly a new and vaster phase of the old struggle between Europe and the Orient. The march of the World's History itself seemed to be violently halted and turned off into a new direction. Europe had been exploiting Asia since the Renascence, and in the Nineteenth Century had begun to grasp after the large empire of China, with the ultimate purpose of dividing its territory. The chief difficulty was that the Europeans quarreled

among themselves over their respective shares of the booty. Such was the condition of things when Japan called a halt to Russia, and indirectly to all Europe, and fought the Russo-Japanese War, which means to the eye of the World-Spirit, that Europe's exploitation of the Yellow Man's land must cease. And all Asia feels the throb of the time, and is reported to be saying throughout its vast expanse: "Asia for the Asiatics." It would seem, then, that a common Oriental consciousness is dawning, being shocked into birth by the remote conflict in its North-East. What never happened through the collisions of West-Asia with Europe—Persian, Arabian, Turkish — has been brought about by this last deed of little Japan. We have already spoken of the rise of the common European consciousness in the time of Charlemagne and more explicitly in the age of the Crusades, whose clash practically united Europe, but seemingly did not unite Asia, only the western portion thereof being involved. But now entire Asia appears to be getting that self-awareness which Europe has long possessed, and which has been a chief source of its intellectual progress as well as of its practical achievement. That enormous Asiatic totality of races and peoples is becoming conscious of being one, of being a single organism with its own life and destiny amid all its diversities. Thus a Europeo-Asian Period with

its interaction between two whole divisions of the Globe, and probably with its fierce conflicts, bursts forth like a sunrise into the old lines of the World's History. An Asiatic Folk-Soul, it would appear, is actually being born and is starting to assert itself against the European.

We may well feel, therefore, that in the present first decade of the Twentieth Century a great historic node has begun to reveal itself, the turn of an epoch. But how great, how far-reaching nobody may yet pretend to say. Time, moving in the slow lapse of generations and perchance of centuries, must uncover a larger arc of the coming cycle ere we can try to define its bearings. But there is little doubt that the horologe of the World's History, after meting and marking on its dial the circling events of thousands of years, has tolled to-day high-noon with a detonation whose echoes have been borne over the globe, and has seemingly started to go around again in its fresh task of measuring the historic acts of the new seculum.

I.

It looks as if Circummigration, which, as we have seen, reaches far back into the pre-historic beginnings of the Aryan race, has about completed itself. In the Japanese people the yellow race has made itself valid against the appropriation of total Asia by the white Europeans. The

Mongolian is civilized, and has shown himself able to handle the military implements of Europe and to turn them against Europe. That is certainly the end of Circummigration in that direction. The yellow man's wall, now built of hundreds of millions of human beings, has thrust its obstruction before the circummigratory waves of Aryans, and at least deflected them from due West to a different latitude.

On the other hand the racial belting of the globe by the Anglo-Saxons is in a way already done. The Americans hold the Philippines and the English hold India and a part of Africa. The girdle is broken in spots, still it is connected enough to suggest the complete act of circummigration. Orient, Europe and Occident are all present in this racial zone, which keeps them in a manner interjoined and clasped together. The same general fact is brought out in the well-known statement that the sun never sets on England's possessions. The Anglo-Saxons have wrenched this peculiar belt of the world's championship mainly from the Spanish, who were the first to realize, even if imperfectly, the Aryan impulse of surrounding the earth with their nationality. Their vast estate, won at the Renascence, has, however, gone into other hands, passing, like so much else, from a Latin to a Teutonic people, upon whom seems to rest at present the fulfillment of the old race-

propelling instinct of circummigration. It may be added here that four out of the five grand divisions of the globe, with nearly all the large islands, are in the possession of the Aryans. In Asia alone has there been any serious contest over racial domination, and a limit placed upon the supremacy of the one circummigratory race.

It has been already observed that the Aryans moved westward on the same parallels of latitude, in the North Temperate Zone, avoiding the extreme heat of the South and the extreme cold of the North. Wherever they went, they had to stay through all the seasons. But now a change begins to show itself, particularly in Western America, where the circumstances are favorable. Man follows the seasons, going north in summer and south in winter, and can work the year round, in spite of heat and cold, perchance at points a thousand miles and more apart. This change depends upon rapid and cheap transportation, which has conveniently arrived when circummigration is blocked. Or perchance we may say that circummigration is diverted from its westward course and begins to whirl from North to South and back again, having become longitudinal rather than latitudinal, and repeating itself in annual rounds, which follow the sun not directly but transversely, approaching the central fire southward in winter and fleeing from it north-

ward in summer (in the Northern Hemisphere). Such is the yearly interzonal migration now starting, in which man is no longer the victim of climate, but the victor over it, chasing down by railroad the weather, and even correcting as far as he is concerned the obliquity of the earth's axis, for he makes the seasons give him pretty nearly the same temperature the year round.

II.

It would seem that in Europe the white man is not altogether without anxiety lest the yellow man should start to circummigrating the globe westward, following the old trail of the Aryans and doing somewhat as they have done. That would indeed be a new kind of world-judgment in which the race receives its requital for its actions as a race. We have often seen, both in drama and in reality, the individual getting back his own, reaping what he has sown. Also peoples and nations have been visited with their wrongful conduct, and scourged even to death by the nemesis of their deeds, as many a bloody page of History shows. But is there a racial retribution to be enacted on this earth-ball, involving more or less every nation and possibly every individual of the guilty race? We have seen the white Aryans circummigrating the earth, capturing, enslaving and destroying its previous possessors. Is their turn now come by the law

of the deed's return, and is this to be the future new theme of the World's History? The keenest-minded sovereign of Europe seems to be pursued by some such presentment, which has had a far-reaching response, sometimes serious but often derisive. Imperial authority has given sanction to "the yellow peril" impending over the white man, to which comes the bodeful reply out of the Far East with a kind of symmetrical echo, telling of "the white peril," which has actually entered the yellow man's world.

Such is the portent, already distinctly outlined upon the heavens, of the possible racial collision which has become a haunting presence to both races, whatever be the outcome. These two races are estimated to be nearly equal in numbers. But if the yellow sovereign of the East can attain to the command of all the peoples of Asia, if he can stir the new-born Asiatic Folk-Soul to union and inspire it with a common purpose against the European, his multitudes may well count double those of his foes. Vague and indecisive is any such reckoning, as it leaves out of the account many important factors; still it has its meaning in a forecast.

The exploitation of the Orient by Europe presents a long line of aggressions to the Oriental mind. The Turk, getting possession of Constantinople, of the islands of the Eastern Mediterranean, and of Alexandria, blocked the easy

intercourse between Europe and West Asia. The result was that the Atlantic States of Europe took to the Ocean, and sailed round the Turk to Middle and Eastern Asia, which then began to enter the World's History. What may be called the Europeo-Asian movement started at the Renascence, and has continued with increasing energy down to the present. Certain European nations began at once to seize the outlying Asiatic islands; but the greatest prize was India, taken in the Eighteenth Century by England from her European competitor, France. In the Nineteenth Century the vast domain of China has been the chief object of seizure and annexation in Asia, by the leading European nations.

Now it was this long series of aggresions, which was halted by the Russo-Japanese war. The latter was likewise a blow which waked all Asia to a consciousness of what she was and of what she might be. It was a blocking of Europe's eastward movement far more effectual than that of the Turk at the Renascence, when he drew his fortified line of East-Mediterranean bulwarks from Anatolia to Egypt. As already stated, Europe flanked the Turkish line by means of the Ocean. She through this act reached Middle and Eastern Asia, and started at once to exploit them for her own advantage. Passive endurance was their habit, calm resignation to God's will was their religion, till the

Japanese example thrilled them with their possibilities, and has at least made them think of union and of self-assertion against the European intruder.

III.

It is manifest that the History of Europe is externally entering upon a new epoch far larger in its area than ever before, involving now the three Asias — Western, Middle and Eastern. Quite all her History till our modern era was the oft-mentioned round between herself and Western Asia. Thus the new Period seems to be emerging, the Europeo-Asian. The first stunning back-stroke of the Asiatic reaction was directly felt by Russia, which had ignorantly challenged it, but the mighty pulsations throbbed through all the rest of Europe, which felt the inbreaking of something stronger and larger than its old historic Periods. The shock of a new æon it may well be deemed, in which Europe's own little History of some 2,500 years was to become but a part of a still vaster process, a mere segment of a still more extended cycle. As the solar system is said to be in a far greater orbit than that of any of its own planets, so the two continental divisions, Europe and Asia, have in the bosom of futurity, besides their own special Histories, a grand historic orbit together, whose sweep will be much

more colossal than that of the former Periods between West-Asia and Europe.

A word we must speak in this connection regarding racial differences. If we take Japan as typical, the yellow man can not only appropriate the white man's supreme mechanical and economic contrivances, but also the latter's institutions. That is verily the greatest cause of wonder. The Anglo-Saxon stock, for instance, has had to evolve slowly and painfully, through many generations of struggle and of blood, its free State. But here comes a people of an alien race who can take it up and function it quite as well as its originators. Such is the marvelous deed of the Japanese in their adoption of English constitutional government. We believe that no Aryan people has shown itself capable of such a feat. Not a few European nations of Aryan blood, after adopting the English State, have made a mess of its administration. Shall we then say that the yellow man has a gift which the white man has not, that of swallowing at once and digesting in a very short time a wholly new and strange institutional world, product of a long evolution by a different race? It is often said that the Mongolian is an expert imitator, especially of machinery; but if he can imitate institutions and make them work as well as those whose spirit gradually created them, then his imitation is as good as originality, if not better

in some respects, and manifests a new kind of genius. If the yellow man can rise to imitate creatively, and can re-make as well as the maker, he has a gift which the white man had better imitate.

Of the religious difference not much can here be said. It would appear that the yellow man prefers to rise into the sphere of universal religion through the doctrine of Buddha, while the white chooses for the same end the doctrine of Christ. But in the bitter, hate-engendering conflict of 1904, which side more adequately exemplified the spirit of universal religion? In answer so much only need be declared: Christendom itself seemed to give judgment against the Christian. And in general Japan represented Europe better than Russia in the opinion of Europe herself. A strange phenomenon it was: the European Folk-Soul largely divested itself of its religious and racial ties, and gave sympathy to another race defending its world.

Of all Oriental countries Japan is the most Occidental in geography and in spirit. Viewed from America it lies in the West; viewed from Europe it lies in the East. One way it is the Occident becoming Orient, the other way it is the Orient becoming Occident. Which is destined to be the stronger current through the future? In either case it seems to have made itself a kind of bridge between the two supreme stages

of the World's History, that of West and that of the East. It has sought to get Occidental culture while remaining Oriental. Is it the clasp simply in the tri-continental belt of civilization extending around the earth, or can it unite and lead all the yellow race and perchance all Asia?

There is another indubitable problem for Japan: Will its extraordinary success beget that pride which has so often caused nations of the white race to undo themselves in their very strength, and which it might see exemplified in its huge Russian foe, who so disdainfully grappled with his small antagonist? The danger of victory is national insolence toward the World-Spirit, who then proceeds to execute judgment upon such nation, and to punish it with defeat and even death for its violation of the supreme end of History.

IV.

If Circummigration has completed its old way of taking spatially successive strides around the globe, and must henceforth move on new lines, the same fact is correspondingly true of Periodicity. This is to be no longer simply a row of Periods temporally successive and pursuing each other around the globe, passing merely from stage to stage, from country to country, and at last from continent to continent, whereof the final result has been designated as the three

Periods — Oriental, European, and Occidental. These three civilizations are getting to be contemporaneous rather than consecutive, each having evolved to a certain unity and independence, and all inter-acting yet moving together toward the great end of History. They are becoming, if they have not already become, the fundamental elements in the evolution of the State universal. To be sure Time still is here, and is going to stay, and will have a part in periodizing the future. And yet the Periods of the past have in a measure realized themselves, and are not merely successive but also synchronous, forming an ever-present process between one another. Thus History in its large sense has already gotten to be inter-continental, and promises to become inter-racial, instead of being only national and inter-national. This does not mean that the nation as such is about to vanish, on the contrary it is going to be preserved as never before, having become an organic member of the great totality of nations which is its saving principle. Often or nearly always have we seen the single nation perish in the past, not being united with the entirety which heals and upholds.

Undoubtedly the inter-racial process of History has not yet defined itself with any distinctness. Japan has largely appropriated Europe's political, economic and educative institutions, clinging meanwhile to its own religion, language and

domestic life. And underneath all these is the original determination of Nature which cannot be so easily changed — race. By way of comparison we may look at another Oriental people in Europe itself. The Turk has not transformed his political, economic and educative institutions to accord with his European environment; he has sought to dominate Europe from the outside, hence has made himself an outsider, an alien intruder, being unwilling or unable to institutionalize himself and thus put himself into harmony with his continental dwelling-place. But Japan on the other side of Asia has internally annexed Europe, having largely assimilated its secular institutions. Still Japan proposes to remain Japan and racial. The East-Asiatic process with Europe, with America, yea with the rest of Asia has evidently set in, forming a strong contrast to the previous limited West-Asiatic movement of History.

Somehow thus the matter stands at present. Hundreds of questions arise at this peep into the historic future. Will the yellow man migrate and exploit other peoples and races, expanding his civilization, as the European has done? But chiefly, will he circummigrate, in imitation of the Aryan? And is there then to be a yellow belt stretched round the globe over the white belt, or alongside of it? The racial collisions which would be likely to spring from

such movements need not now be even conceived, except so far as to note in view of our theme that the World's History is becoming inter-racial.

Dropping these questioning glimpses into the future, we turn now to the past as it has revealed itself in European History. Limited this may be, still it will not lack in greatness and complexity. It is as yet the most complete and best documented portion of the World's record. The ever-present object of this book will be to unfold and formulate the processes immanent in the vast mass of events, and indeed creative of them, whereby we may hope in a manner to re-create within ourselves the generating thought which has expressed itself on this earth-encompassing page of universal History.

PART FIRST.

Ancient European History.

The civilization of European antiquity clings to a sea which it surrounds — the Mediterranean. At first there is a great diversity of peoples inhabiting the shores of this sea; but they are finally united under one government, that of Rome. What we have called the Ethnic Protoplasm, in its dumbly propelling instinct of migration, surged upon this vast Midland Sea at many different times and places, in a very divided condition. But the Mediterranean world interconnects its peoples spatially, and becomes the arena on which and also through which they are to be brought together under one political form, and to be united in one civiliza-

tion. If we look at a map of the Roman Empire we find it encircling the Great Sea in a sort of an oval outline; and if we follow the movement of Roman History, we see it radiating from its central city in the central peninsula on the Northern side, till it embraces all lands lying around the Mediterranean basin. This also furnished the proper territorial limit of imperial Rome, beyond which she sometimes strained herself to pass, but the effort was unnatural and injurious. We may say, therefore, in view of History, that the function of the Roman Empire was to unify the Mediterranean world, and to produce a common Mediterranean consciousness in its bordering peoples. The evolution of such a consciousness, especially in its political aspect, is the chief theme of Ancient European History, which, beginning in Greece and passing to Rome, gradually makes the circuit of this marine world.

From the present point of view we may designate the civilization of antiquity as circummarine; its territorial cycle is to go around and encompass the Sea, or the Great Sea, as it was often called by its adjacent inhabitants. Moreover it is one race, the Aryan, which performs the work of circumscribing this lesser sea-world, prophetic of its coming task of circumscribing the greater ocean-world. Already we have dwelt upon the Aryan circummigratory instinct, which

is realizing itself in our own time by belting the whole earth. But that is the last act of the World's History, the circumterrene; now we are to contemplate its first act which is the circummarine, is the old historic round which forecasts and indeed generates the new.

Another distinctive fact to be emphasized in the present connection is that the Mediterranean washes the shores of three continents — Africa, Asia and Europe, separating them indeed, but in a deeper sense joining them together, welding them on three different sides in a common medium of intercommunication. It may well be deemed the heart of the Eastern Hemisphere, which concentrates itself in it and around it, and pulses life into the World's History, in which all three continents are to participate. Moreover man is here trained to navigation, without which there could be no transition from continent to continent, and hence no unification of their peoples in one civilized totality. Greece must pass from island to island in ships, and Rome must cross to Africa in a fleet, ere the work of a Mediterranean civilization can be accomplished.

The ancient History of Europe is, accordingly, tri-continental. In antiquity we have to note that European History is not confined to Europe, but involves a part of Asia and also of Africa. Really no continental whole is at first historic,

but a side of each continent is taken and then the three sides are conjoined in an imperial entirety by Rome. Still we have to call the History of this achievement European, since the people who performed it dwelt in Europe on the coast of the North-Mediterranean, and began the evolution of European civilization, which goes back in an unbroken line of descent to antiquity.

We have then to see that Ancient European History does not include the whole of Europe territorially or spiritually. In a sense there is anciently no Europe, the European consciousness is not yet born. The Mediterranean world alone, at least in imperial times, had become aware of itself as civilized and as one; it sharply distinguished itself from the environing peoples to the North, to the East, and to the South, all of whom were deemed barbarous. The Roman rim of Empire surrounded this vast Mediterranean world and held it together, making it conscious of its unity through commerce, law, and government, as well as through military power. We have therefore to grasp the important fact that the European Folk-Soul, which is such a striking historic phenomenon to-day, did not yet exist, though certainly implicit, and even then blindly struggling toward existence. But that which did exist, and which antiquity evolved and brought to its highest bloom, was the Mediterranean Folk-Soul, tri-continental, circummarine, and also es-

sentially of one race, the Aryan. For the dominant stocks of this ancient period, the Greek and the Roman, were of Aryan blood, though they had to fight repeatedly with the Semite for supremacy over the Great Sea and over its civilization.

The foregoing statement leads us to note that there has been a racial contest from the beginning of History till the present time for the Mediterranean with its manifold gifts and destinies. The Aryan from its Northern side, and the Semite from its Eastern and Southern sides, battled over its inheritance at the historic dawn. The Semitic Phenician ploughed it first, seemingly, from end to end, and even passed outside of it into the Ocean both Northward and Southward. But the Phenician went down, being subjugated on land by the Persian, and being supplanted on water by the Greek. Still Carthage, the daughter of Phenicia, challenged in Sicily the supremacy of the Greek, and was getting the better of him, when the Roman appeared and took his place in the great world-historical conflict, which has produced such a mighty impression upon mankind that every schoolboy knows the result. Rome destroyed Carthage, and rapidly won the whole Mediterranean world, holding it under sway for many hundred years. But that was not the end of the Titanic struggle of races for the prize of a

world. Another Semitic branch, the Arabian, smote this circummarine Empire of Rome in a racial and religious fury, and shivered it, separating its Eastern and Southern sides from the Northern, and starting a new Period of European History. For this was the event which broke to pieces the tri-continental Empire of Rome and limited Europe to Europe, which is henceforth to have its own historic development, and to attain a consciousness of itself as European.

Thus we seek to catch a first glimpse of the arena of Ancient European History, and to mark down its limits in Space and Time. Being dominantly uniracial, it draws to its end as soon as a second race breaks into its Mediterranean enclosure, tearing away its extra-European domains, and even intruding upon Europe when the Arabians seize and hold Spain. Such is the territorial separation, which is the condition and at the same time the forecast of a new historic Period.

I. Let now the serious student take his map in hand and devote some persistent and penetrating glances to this Mediterranean and its adjoining territory. It is the primal physical background of European History, and gives many a suggestion of and to its coming human inhabitant. We do not say that it is the cause or the parent of Man's historic doings in Europe; for he

brought something with him out of Asia — his racial character and his incipent institutions. But there is no doubt that Man and Nature show a certain affinity and harmony in the Mediterranean basin, as if sprung originally from the same source and co-operating unto the same end. Man cannot make Nature and Nature cannot make Man; both are independent in genesis, though deeply co-related, and they must be seen working together in History, paired, yea twinned in a certain divine kinship. God, Nature, and Man are the three co-efficients in the process of the Universe, which realizes itself in History as one of its manifestations.

We shall therefore seek to grasp not only the physical facts but also the physical suggestiveness of this Mediterranean Nature. Primarily it reaches out from the motherland, Asia, like a long arm to the Ocean on the West, which it pierces as it were with its forefinger at the Straits of Gibraltar. Thus Asia gets to the Atlantic or perchance points to it as the direction toward which her teeming peoples are to move in the future, and even makes a route along which they are to travel toward a new civilization.

The sweep of the Midland Sea is, accordingly, from East to West, or conversely from West to East, but not on a straight line. It is made of two huge waves, an up and a down, with a

partial recovery. If we start from the Straits of Gibraltar, there is a rapid, yet billowy ascent through more than ten degrees, up toward the heart of Europe, then follows a sudden fall back upon Africa, after which comes a slight new rise toward Asia, where it stops. Such is the tri-continental sweep of the Mediterranean which seems by its general attitude to show its grades of preference for the three different continents.

The same thing is suggested from another point of view. The Great Sea has its human resemblance both in its proportions and in its outline; we may deem it an enormous giant lying prostrate, with his back upon Africa, his head upon a strip of West-Asia, and the front of his body turned toward Europe. What a difference in his aspect on the North and on the South! His three great peninsulas are European, the islands of the Mediterranean are almost exclusively on the Northern side; the European coast-line is several times longer than the African. Europe is clearly the Mediterranean's favorite, her land being embraced by him in many a wind and turn, great and small. The genetic power of the Sea is directed upon Europe, where it will show itself as nowhere else; it will help the infantile man streaming along its Northern shore with his budding institutions, to rise to a great civilization. But somehow it seems to be looking away contemptuously from poor Africa, who

will have to wait long for her opportunity to participate in the World's History. Thus the given Man and the given Nature at the given moment not only co-operate, but get married; truly Europe and the Mediterranean are wedded, at least were so in antiquity, and their child was ancient European civilization with its History. Venice celebrated her nuptials with the Adriatic; but the entire Mediterranean world could have joined in one vast marine marriage festival under the auspices of the Roman Empire.

A latitudinal line entering the Straits of Gibraltar, and, drawn eastward, would come out not far from the bay of Issus (*Issicus Sinus*) in the North-Eastern corner of the Sea. The length of such a line extends over forty degrees, and shows the rise above and the fall below, or the undulations which have been already mentioned as the characteristic form of the total body of water. It should be added that the rise toward Europe is at least five degrees more than the fall toward Africa, as if the prostrate aqueous shape might be struggling upward to embrace its continental favorite. And if we take the most Northern point reached by the Adriatic, the Mediterranean billows throb into the heart of Europe till they reach a latitude almost as high as the upper coast of the Euxine. Again we cannot help noting the Great Sea's decided preference for one of the three wooing continents

which hug its shores. The Mediterranean love for Europa we may deem it, rivaling that of Zeus himself who first bore her away from Phenicia to Crete, swimming through this very Sea out of Asia to Europe. So the legend runs, hinting unconsciously, as usual, of far-off things to be. But passing from the mythical love-story to the World's History, we have to bring out strongly the advantages which Nature through the Mediterranean gave to the European peoples dwelling upon its shores.

In contrast with this latitudinal division, we have to consider a longitudinal division which may be conceived as running North and South along the Eastern coast of Sicily. Thus the Sea is separated into two equal halves about, each of which has its own historic destiny. In general we may call this the line of the Adriatic dividing Italy and the West from Greece and the East, which line Rome crossed in her conquests going in one direction, and which the Turk, coming from the opposite direction in a refluent wave of victory, reached but never really crossed. Sicily indeed is the bridge, or rather a huge stepping-stone from continent to continent, Africa lying only seventy miles from her coast. Once the grand question of the World's History rose just here: Shall Europe cross to Africa or Africa to Europe? Rome and Carthage were the world-historical contestants, the one being Aryan and the other Semitic.

There seems to have been no special name in earlier antiquity for the Mediterranean, this name occurring first in post-classical authors like Solinus. Polybius calls it the inner Sea in contrast with the outer Sea or Ocean, which he had evidently seen. Others, like Mela, affectionately designate it as "our Sea." Strabo, the geographer, describes it quite fully in the first century B. C. It is essentially a land-locked, closed Sea, with the one narrow outlet, and forms with its adjacent territories a kind of ellipse, a whole rounded off and marked out on the Earth's surface as the scene of the History of Greco-Roman antiquity. This irregular ellipse extended from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Euphrates, in two great arcs, one to the South in Africa and one to the North in Europe, till the ends united in the Orient. Such was in general the territorial Rim of the Roman Empire — a most important conception for the latter's History. Now it was just this ellipse with its two arcs that the Arabians smote and divided permanently; the Northern arc remained European and Christian and Aryan, the Southern arc from the Euphrates to the Atlantic became Oriental, Mohomedan, Semitic, and even curved around like a crescent, its symbol, into Europe at the Straits of Gibraltar, occupying for a long time Spain and for a while even a part of France. Here we must not fail to remark that with the

separation of this antique ellipse into its two arcs, the old period really came to an end; the one ancient Empire became two Empires, with two different religions and two different races, whence sprang the deepest conflict of a new historic Period. The oval shape of that classic realm suggests the egg-shell which was now broken, the meat within having become addled; the imperial, yea the cosmic egg has to be renewed. This renewal is the slow work of another era, that of the Middle Ages, whose History in its depths unfolds from the interaction and collision of two Mediterranean Empires, each having its own race, religion and civilization.

Thus Ancient European History is not yet continental, but rather tri-continental, embracing parts of three continents. Not till the Middle Ages does the threefold continental separation take place, completely and consciously. Each continent thereafter is to have its own historic evolution. Africa seems destined to be first and last on the stage of the World's History. First it was in the ages, with Egypt as forerunner of the earth's civilization. At the present time it seems to be just starting again, but as a whole continent, and not merely in that little Egyptian corner. To the eyes of antiquity Africa was a narrow seam of land bordered by the Sea on one side, but on the other cut off from the civilized world by an inhospitable desert

of sand. No wonder that the Mediterranean turned his back upon such an outlook southward, and faced Europe and the North with his gifts and his smiles. Western Asia is in part sandy (behind Syria) and in part fertile (Anatolia); it may be said that Mediterranean Asia is half African and half European as to territorial character. Those two arcs of the antique ellipse already described will each make its own half at the grand Mahomedan separation, and a sand-faring people, the Arabians, will seize their side at once, surging from Syria to the Straits of Gibraltar. But the Northern arc has no such background of desert, as has the Southern; Europe, not separated within itself by sand, as is the case with Africa and also with Asia, is destined to be first in attaining a common continental consciousness, a relatively homogeneous civilization. Europe is indeed separated internally by mountains, but these can be passed far more easily than a vast area of sand, which however, produces its own distinctive people, or rather race. The Aryans, the greatest land-farers on the globe and also the greatest sea farers, appear never to have been great sand-farers, even in the Orient. The Arabian conqueror, with his peculiar racial character and religion, is a product of the desert, not of the mountain, or the sea, or the river-valley. Every where we behold Man with his institutional

character and Nature with her physical character inter-acting and mutually formative, and finally co-operating toward some great world-historical purpose.

II. And now, having considered Nature, the setting and indeed the physical mould of Spirit, in this Mediterranean world, we are next led to ask what kind of Institutions, especially what kind of a State will rise, flourish, and then decline in such an environment. A primal political form will migrate into it from Asia — the Village Community, which is thus the given starting-point of European historic evolution. This germinal State will be unfolded in the North-Mediterranean basin, which is to witness primarily the development of the tribal community into the civilized City-State. The sea-line is broken up into peninsulas and islands, great and small, which furnish homes for the rising political Institution, as yet but an infant and needing the protection of these watery walls. We have already seen physical Asia dividing itself up and particularizing itself in physical Europe, using the Sea as its natural means of territorial division. In deep correspondence, or rather co-operation, with Nature, Europe brings forth and vindicates the State particular (Polyarchy) as distinct from the Oriental absolutism (Henarchy). In fact, we must rise to the thought of the All-Self (Pampsychosis) differentiating itself his-

torically and becoming Asiatic and European, with which separation the historic consciousness properly begins. Look into Herodotus, the father of Historiography, whose deepest function was to historicize just this grand separation between Asia and Europe through the written word.

What we designate as the Ancient History of Europe has to do with one form of the political Institution: the City-State. Greece, the Roman Republic, the Roman Empire all show stages in the development of the City-State. With the advent of the Middle Ages, another governmental form enters and gradually becomes dominant: the Nation-State, which was introduced in its germ through the Teutonic tribes storming down upon the Roman Empire. But in antiquity, the City is the paramount political institution, controlling all others and passing through a varied evolution within itself, whose manifestation outwardly is to be traced in the complex shifting play of historic occurrences.

What is this City-State? Ultimately it is just the function of Ancient History to tell. Already we have sought to give some idea of the State in general, indicating its place in the grand totality of Institutions as that form of human association which is to secure man's free activity through the Law. Now the City-State is one phase of the State as such, which in the antique

world had a grand historic career as a whole, with rise, bloom and decline. Indeed we shall behold many such careers in the individual City-States of the ancient time, since each of them more or less distinctly bore the impress of the total process of which it was a part, though perchance only an atom.

Undoubtedly we have cities in modern times, and very great ones, but they are not the whole government, they do not comprise nationality and sometimes tilt against it. London is not England, and even Paris is not France, though often declared to be. The largest and most important Capitol does not subsume, but is subsumed by the Nation. But in antiquity the individual was bounded politically by the horizon of his community, even if this became much widened with the passing centuries. In fact it was this widening and stretching of the City-State which finally shivered it internally, through the attempt to nationalize it, to make it something which it could not be. For there was within the ancient City-State a driving power which forced it to transcend its limits. This driving power, propelling all governmental forms beyond themselves into new ones, is verily the secret Demiurge of History, unmaking the State to re-make it, destroying the old and calling forth the higher. He develops the ancient European City-State for a thousand years and

more, then he thrusts it to the rear of the great forward movement of the ages.

If the end of History be the universal State, we are to see the ancient City-State of Europe as a necessary stage toward such end. All States must seek to be universal, to be that form of political association which is to include mankind and thereby to safeguard completely the freedom and the rights of every individual. Of course no such State has yet fully appeared, though it may be glimpsed even now. Still every State, even the humblest, has an ideal end of this kind in its very nature; otherwise it could not be a State at all, since this must have as its propelling soul the instinct of universality, the aspiration to be the universal State. When such an aspiration dies then the hour strikes for another State to take the burden of progress. Or we may say that the World-Spirit appears in such a conjuncture, and pronounces judgment for the outgoing as well as the incoming order.

Our present undertaking is, then, to deal with the European City-State of the ancient world, as the dominant political Institution whose development sends the life-blood through History. We shall see that this governmental form will fulfill for an epoch its function, and then will break to pieces, being unable to meet the next higher requirement of the universal State. Athens, Rome, Constantinople will have their

turns, will meet for a time the mighty exigency of the World-Spirit, and then will sink under the task which is truly theirs, the task of realizing their own ideal of the State. Difficult indeed is the problem, but it underlies all History. How can this individual State become universal? The antique City-State, always more or less particularistic, will live in a perpetual struggle with its universality, and finally go down beneath the conflict.

III. As its hyphened name implies, the City-State is the State as City, as a single community governing itself and perchance governing other communities. The City-State is conceived as having a strong political individuality self-centered, self-sufficing, self-contained. It may be large or small within itself; it may be confined to its own walls or may rule an empire; the Roman City-State held sway over the Mediterranean world. Primarily it is an associated body of men, limited to one place under their own government.

But this government may be of various kinds. The ancient Greeks having their own City-State before their minds, declared it to have three leading divisions — monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy — which were still further sub-divided. These three divisions, as we have already seen (p. 49), may be traced back, in their incipient form to the Village Community, from which

the City-State is derived. It would seem that several of such Village Communities, being joined together and consolidated, produced the historic City-State of Europe, which is thus a new commonalty of older separated communities. This process of communal unification which brought forth the City-State was known to the Greeks and given a special name (*sunoikismos*). The earliest accounts of Athens, Sparta and Rome indicate this important step, which is really a transition out of the pre-historic Ethnic Protoplasm to a new historic Institution. This is rightly celebrated as the work of the famous founders of cities, notably of Theseus and Romulus.

The City-State, then, divided in one way, is monarchic, aristocratic, or democratic, or often some combination thereof. These three governmental forms were churned over especially in ancient Greece, which had hundreds of such communal centers, little and large, busily active and volcanic. With them the great problem was: Which shall it be, Monarchos, Aristos, or Demos? Which shall have the authority and administer the Institution? Thus the history of Greece seems to be a stream made up of hundreds of eddies, most of them small but very agitated. It shows that strong primal separation, which sprang from the Greek reaction against the Asiatic oneness of the State, more or less violent and autocratic.

Here we may note another division of the City-State according to locality — the Oriental, the European, and the intermediate or Phenician. These three divisions are successive in time as well as in place. The City-State of the River-Valley arises first in Asia. Then an Oriental Semitic people, the Phenicians, reach the Sea, become great navigators and build the first marine cities. Their successors are the European Aryan peoples, who establish the North-Mediterranean City-State with its civilization, which is distinctively the institutional form dominating our theme, Ancient European History. Let the reader passingly observe that two Empire City-States will unfold — that of the Orient and that of Europe; the latter is Rome, which in Constantinople shows a decided return toward the Oriental beginning.

We are, therefore, to take into account the fact that the Orient has also City-States which have certainly had a strong influence upon the evolution of the Greek City-State. Babylon, Nineveh, Thebes, though of the Orient, have left a decided impress upon the ancient History of Europe. The Oriental City-State naturally sprang up in the vast River-Valleys, which were very fertile and afforded the easiest interchange among men through their water courses. Thus were large bodies of men first associated and civilized. The Oriental City-State is the home of

man's earliest civilization, probably in the Valley of the Nile. Its characteristic is colossality, in which a vast humanity is massified rather than organized. The rule is rudely autocratic, representing the naked majesty of an all-dominating Will, which simply wills itself against every other Will, be this of the people within, or of the nations without. Yet we are not to forget that the people of the Orient see themselves in such an absolute authority; Will worships its own supreme majesty in the King or Emperor. The Egyptian pyramid still stands as the best symbol or artistic manifestion of the Oriental City-State and of its massed magnitude. Little individual development could the human being have in such a packed condition; still this was his Will, yea, in a sense his Free-Will.

In the Oriental City-State, wealth, luxury, property, yea personal ownership arose and therein started distinctly what is called civilization. Such is the transition out of the tribal stage with its Village Community, in which man is not his own fully, not self-possessed and hence not possessed of an ownership of external things, specially not of the soil. Some have traced back the land tenure of the individual to the alluvial gifts of the Nile. At any rate the Oriental City-State of the River Valley is the historic pre-supposition of the Greek and European City-State, or one of its historic pre-suppositions.

IV. Still there was not an immediate spring from the vast communities of the Orient to the little ones of Greece, from the Euphrates and the Nile to a practically riverless land, from a fluvial to a marine civilization. There was an intervening mediatorial City-State which led from the East to Hellas; a bridge we may call it which the World-Spirit constructed for civilization to pass to the West out of its Oriental home. This intermediate land was Phenicia, a narrow strip of coast lying on the Mediterranean in Syria, and inhabited by sailors, merchants, manufacturers and artisans of many kinds. Through the Phenicians the two great Rivers, the Nile and the Euphrates, were made to pour into the Western Sea, whose territories thus received the products of the Orient. Europe sent back its materials in return, for instance, amber from the distant North, and tin from the more distant Britain.

Phenicia was a small cluster of City-States. Sidon between Tyre and Aradus was properly the mother-city, though each sought to be independent under its own king. Tyre grew to be the largest and obtained a kind of supremacy, though with strong opposition from the others. We see here the forecast of the coming Greek world, though the Phenician nation has left almost no record of itself, in striking contrast with the Greek and Hebrew. Evidently the

Phenicians were in the bloom of their power during the time of Homer, who makes frequent allusion to them in his tales of Menelaus and Helen, and also of the swineherd Eumæus. But when Herodotus appears their day is past; they had fallen before the Oriental conquerer, Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian. The Greek navigator takes the place of the Phenician upon sea, and enters History triumphantly as a sailor. The half mythical Thalassocracy (rule of the sea) ascribed to Cretan Minos must have been won chiefly from the Phenicians.

In race the Phenicians were Semites, cousins to the Hebrews and Arabians. We may deem theirs the first great Semitic influence directed upon Europe, not religious, or political, but essentially commercial. Their religion was seemingly polytheistic. They had a kind of Pantheon which the Greek interpreted into his own; the first divinity was Melkarth, or Hercules, tamer of wild nature, wild animals, and wild men; he was also a rover of the sea, and a god of colonies. Famous too was Astarte, the Phenician Venus. Very different seems the intense monotheism as well as religiosity of the Hebrew and Arabian, neither of whom took to the sea decidedly, or resembled the Phenicians in their exclusive devotion to commerce. A deep separation in the Semitic race we note in the present fact. Still both sides may be deemed to have a

mediatorial character, though the one be religious and the other secular.

This mediating character of the Phenician City-State we may unfold somewhat. It had an inland connection through caravans with the great river-cities of Asia, which were not marine, and so could not easily reach Greece and Europe. In Western Asia the Phenician was the original Oriental sailor. He first put to use the Mediterranean and started its distinctive civilization, which moved by sea toward the West, and soon landed on the shores of Hellas. He was also a great colonizer, scattering his settlements on both sides of the Mediterranean as far as Spain, to which he gave the first Semitic dip, repeated twice afterwards by Carthagenians and Arabians, not to speak of continued migrations of Jews thither. It would seem that the Phenician was a bolder navigator than the Greek, passing outside the Pillars of Hercules and coasting up and down the Ocean. According to a well-known passage of Herodotus, Phenician sailors circumnavigated Africa — a feat never accomplished by the later Greco-Roman world. Not till the modern time was the Cape of Good Hope again rounded and the sun again seen in the North by Portuguese sailors. Carthage was the greatest of Phenician colonies and inherited the mother's naval skill, which we shall see later employed against the Romans.

Intellectually also Phenicia had a mediatorial function in bringing Asia to Europe. It gave the alphabet to Greece and to all European peoples. The picture-sign (hieroglyphic) of Egypt seems to have been transformed into a sound-sign by the Phenician mind — a great step in human culture. To-day we read in Phenician characters essentially. The Greeks had a story attributing the introduction of letters to Cadmus of Phenicia. The art of the east and many mechanical inventions traveled westward the same way.

And still the Phenicians had the opposite trait also: they were secretive, they tried to keep their knowledge of lands and seas and navigation to themselves, as well as their skill in the arts. They were not self-revealing like the Greeks, and hence have left no literature and no history of their own. Herein they differ also from the Hebrews, who have made a Bible. So have the Arabians too, who traverse an area like the sea in their desert with its winds and sand waves. Possibly the Phenicians evolved, in part at least, as sea-farers out of the old Semites as sand-farers, whose camel swaying up and down was the ship of the desert, and whose ship rocking on the billows was the camel of the sea. But they transmitted no account of themselves, no speech like Greek and Hebrew, no means of communication with them-

selves and with others. We have to conclude that by the judgment of the World-Spirit they had nothing worthy and peculiar to communicate, they were in their deepest nature go-betweens — a very necessary but transitory function.

In the smallness of its territory as well as in its situation, Phenicia resembled Greece. A narrow strip of sea-coast, 120 miles long, and never more than twenty miles wide—often much less — is the locality, with Mount Lebanon not far off, and covered with timber for ship-building. This little land had its thriving City-States like Greece, but was ruled despotically and hence could not not have the political life of Greece.

Such is this Phenician world, intermediate and mediating between the Orient and the West. It connects with the Hebrews, in whose literature we read the name of Hiram, King of Tyre and friend of Solomon. The prophets have not spared to denounce it for its sins, chief of which was its commercialism. With the Egyptians and Babylonians it trades, reaching out to India and possibly to China, and thus making itself the center through which the total Orient first reaches Europe with a certain civilizing influence, especially through Art and mechanical devices. Nor should we omit to mention the story of the origin

of the Phenicians told by Herodotus, that they had migrated from the Persian Gulf to Syria (VII, 89). Strabo declares that there were in his time two islands called Tyre and Aradus (later names of two Phenician cities) in the Persian Gulf, whose inhabitants claimed to be the original Phenicians. If this be so, their commercial enterprise may have reached as deep into Asia as it did into Europe, traversing the seas eastward and westward from Ocean to Ocean, and furnishing the earliest glimmer of a world-commerce.

V. Looking back at the great fluvial City-States of the Orient and specially of West-Asia, we have to regard them as the predecessors of European civilization, to whom we shall find ancient Europe repeatedly returning. The imperial City-State of the East did not vanish from the World's History, but continued to re-appear under new forms and conditions, both in Hellas and Rome. Thus their political norm, though changed, did not fail to persist.

They also made many special contributions to Hellas and the West. The time-measurer, the dial, is said to have come from Babylon. The space-measurer by the line is said to have come from Egypt, a land devoted to geometry. Chaldaeans were astronomical observers, whose science passed to Hellas. Coined money, so needful for commerce, is traced back through Phenicia to

Babylon, and involves some fixed standard of weight. Oriental civilization seems confined and unable to get out of itself without the Semitic mediator, whose function is to bring it to the West. Both the Assyrian and the Egyptian conquerors sought to possess Phenicia as holding the key of the future. The River-City of the East has a longing to get to the Sea-City, which performs a service for it which it can not perform for itself — mediates it with that new European world which is rising.

The Oriental mind, as we view it, is held fast in political and sacerdotal chains, and cannot get free through itself. Still we may faintly hear it sigh for a world of freedom. Man in the Orient is under a severe training which is to eliminate the natural caprice of barbarism and subject him to an institutional life in State and Religion. The people are consolidated into one vast mass of will, represented by a single will, that of the sovereign who reveals to his subjects their own self as arbitrary and despotic. 'The Oriental experience is man's own, he finds himself out. The first discipline of civilization is the Oriental City-State of the River Valley. It is a political institution, which secures freedom by destroying it as a caprice, and trains man to toil out of indolence, constructing a bulwark within and without against savagery. The Chinese wall, as well as the Median, signifies a pro-

tection against those Oceanic waves of barbarous will which would start from the vast steppes of the North and overflow the budding civilization of the South. Such a wall had also an inner meaning for its builders, who had first to put down their own barbarism before it could be erected. The mountainous ramparts of enclosed Babylon, as described by Herodotus, not only defend outwardly but point inwardly to the institution, to the Oriental City-State with its mighty power of massed will, very slightly as yet individualized.

So we may glimpse the historic purport of the huge City-States of the Nile and the Euphrates, institutionally as ponderous as their deeds and their works, in contrast with Phenicia and Hellas. Egypt and Assyria, however, though both had the colossality of the Orient, differed in character and produced different sorts of men. The Nile overflowed of itself, and gave its gift as if directly from the gods. The water of the Euphrates had to be lifted by human effort, by machinery and so developed a more mechanical mind, developed a people more devoted to utility and quite incapable of the abstract idealism of the pyramid and the obelisk. On the Nile man lived to work, on the Euphrates he worked to live. Being furnished with food almost free, the Egyptian could devote himself to the Fine Arts, while the Asyrian, having

to labor for his food, begins the Mechanic Arts in aid of his toil. Both these kinds of Arts will pass into Greece and there meet with a new evolution in a new sort of City-State. It is evident, however, that the Nile aids the incipient man, its almost helpless infant, to a start in civilization more than any other stream or locality on the globe. Hence not the Egyptians alone but all mankind can call that parental stream by the affectionate name of Father Nile.

But our main point in the present connection is to indicate the remarkable road of civilization starting from the fluvial City-State of the Orient, and passing through the marine City-State also of the Orient, to the marine City-State of Europe. The latter, moving from Greece to Rome, will widen itself out till it embraces the entire Mediterranean world, reaching back to the Orient and taking up the original fluvial City-State on the Nile and Enphrates. Such is the cycle, territorally and temporally, of Ancient European History, in whose physical character three leading qualities — tri-continental, circummarine, and dominantly uniracial — have been emphasized in the foregoing account.

VI. We may here recall the elemental unities of total Europe: it is uniracial, unilingual, unireligious, and indeed unipolitical in the inherited Village Community. Now this elemental oneness which is more or less pre-historic, uncon-

scious and uncivilized, is to differentiate primarily into many particular States and therein become historic, civilized, conscious of itself as European even in its differences. The political dualism of European History we have already expressed as the ever recurring struggle between Polyarchy and Henarchy (p. 25). In spite of its strong unitary impulse, Europe has persisted in being Polyarchic. This fact is what doubtless determines its place in the larger process of the World's History, of which it is ultimately one stage along with Asia and America. The instinctive Henarchic tendency of Europe will remain probably implicit, undeveloped for the present, an undoubted part of its inner process, which however allies it to something beyond itself, and points to the great end of History, the State universal.

In fact the deepest historic movement of Europe springs from its political inability, both in its totality and in its separate governmental parts, to make real its own unity or its Henarchy. Herein lies the dialectic of each particular European State of the past: aspiring and trying to be universal (as it must), it undoes itself as particular. This abstract statement will be exemplified by concrete instances hereafter.

At present we must strongly bring to mind the dualistic character of Europe as a derived world, especially in its political phase. The State comes

from Asia, being, as it were, directed from above, God-given, pre-established for man, who is simply to bow down to it, without protest. But in Europe the individual starts to work up from below, will reconstruct the political fabric in part, though not wholly; he begins to re-make the already made. The European man will have his State and everything else partly God-given and partly Man-given; exactly where the line of division is to be drawn has fluctuated much, and has been the source of much of Europe's struggle. On the one hand are royalty and nobility, of divine origin and authority; on the other, is the challenge of both by the people, who demand, not the whole usually, but their portion. European History is a political compromise, from Hellas till now. The problem is: In what degree and in what proportion and in what way can we conjoin Heaven and Earth, the principle coming down from above and the principle coming up from below, prescription and origination? Europe is the derived, as already said, the transmitted primarily from the East; yet it also challenges out of itself its Oriental source, and moves against it, subordinating it often. We shall often see European History going back to the Orient, not only to recover but to remake its origin; Europe must not be simply derivative but also originative, and must make itself such.

So in Europe man starts to re-make for himself the institutions already made and transmitted from the past and the East. This is what he calls his struggle for freedom. The established order into which he is born he must re-establish, and thus be ruled by his own, by himself, in part at least. History shows him beginning in a small way, for he is as yet small and weak. The little Greek City-State we may take as the starting-point in Europe. We see the people, or some of them, winning a share in the government of this little Institution, as little as its man is. His political ideal becomes autonomy, as he calls it, a very important word in the development of freedom, by no means obsolete to-day. The outcome is a galaxy of many Hellenic City-States which fall into collision with one another, as we see in the History of Thucydides. For this malady, sprung of her own consciousness, the Greek world has no remedy. So in the fullness of time, or in the movement of the World's History, Rome, another City-State, but with a different character and function, appears on the scene. Rome is to take the grand step in advance: as Greece associated individual men in its City-States, scattering the latter everywhere in its confines, Rome is to associate these scattered City-States into one City-State, which is itself. Rome must first proceed to associate separated elements, which it does through the

long contests between plebeians and patricians; then when it can cure itself, it may be able to cure others. Rome thus subordinates cities, peoples, tribes, to the one City-State. It seeks to make itself universal, and therein it becomes Empire, having quite overcome for a time the ethnic principle which begins later the fight for its own restoration, the supporters thereof being at first the barbarians of the North. For these too have their idea, their purpose in the World's History, which through them smites the Roman Empire into tribal fragments — each Teutonic tribe going down into it and taking a slice of its territory. The historic result is the rise of the Nation-State out of the City-State through the Ethnic State.

Already Rome, in making itself universal in the Empire, breaks within, contradicting its own fundamental nature. For the particular City-State has become negative to all particular States in subjecting them, and hence at bottom to itself. The History of Rome is that of the particular State making itself universal, but destroying itself in the process. Rome we are to see undoing itself in its total sweep of more than a thousand years. The same thing, but in a different way, we see take place also in the case of Greece. Both at last are summoned before the supreme Tribunal of History, over which presides the World-Judge administering the law of

the State universal, in accord with which he delivers judgment upon the nations.

VII. And now let us bring together in a brief summary the main organic links of the foregoing exposition. Of Ancient European History what is the round or cycle? It definitely starts from the autonomous City-State of Greece assailed by Lydia and then by Persia, till the imperial City-State of Greece is assailed by the Arabian Mahommedan. Note the two grand assaults from West-Asia as the given limits; also note the two kinds of Greek City-States, the communal and the imperial—the former being the immediate spontaneous growth of Hellas, the latter coming through Rome to Constantinople. Also there is the movement from Polyarchy to Henarchy, with return to the former. Also there is the movement from the dissociated communities to the associated one, which arises through Rome and the Christian Church. These statements are indeed abstract—general forms they may be deemed, into which the student is to pour all the historic events of ancient Europe.

It has been noticed that the total sweep of Ancient European History consists of three great stages: Hellas, Rome, Empire. These are to be seen having their common fundamental process together, and at the same time each has its own inner process, which is a re-

flection of the entirety. We shall send out in advance, as a sort of guide-line for the student, a brief formulation of these three stages.

(1). *Hellas.* The ancient European City-State as Polyarchic. Also marine (Mediterranean) and Aryan, as distinguished from the fluvial and the marine (Semitic) City-State of the Orient.

Or the City State as dissociative, which moves, however, to an external association through Macedon and then Rome. Thus Hellas fights the State universal (the end of History), yet is bringing it forth, or a certain form of it. This is the inherent self-negating principle in Greek History (or its dialectic).

The scene is primarily the Greek Peninsula proper, which widens itself out to embrace Macedonia with two wings, one in the East and one in the West, the Oriental and the Italic Greek world.

Both territorially and spiritually Hellas is the prelude of separative Europe, as it appears historically in succession to Asia.

(2) *Rome* (*Republic*). The ancient European City-State as Henarchic internally through law (not externally through mere violence like tribal Macedon). Also Mediterranean and Aryan.

Or the City-State as associative — which associates East and West, the civilized and the uncivilized, the City-State and the Tribe, establish-

ing a world of Justice, of course after much violence.

Yet this associative power shows its limit both externally and internally. Rome has its Rim drawn all around itself, being confined substantially to the Mediterranean world, and being unable to take up the whole of the Ethnic Protoplasm even in Europe, for instance the Teutonic.

Rome manifests the Universal (as State) embodying itself in the Particular (as State), which is in general the post-Hellenic or Hellenistic movement. This is its deepest inner doubleness and contradiction, which finally breaks it in twain.

(3) *Rome (Empire).* The ancient European City-State as realized Henarchy separates within itself and goes back to Polyarchy, which, however, is not the first one of Hellas. Such is the inner process of the Roman Empire, which divides into two (and even more) imperial or Henarchic City-States, the Eastern and the Western, the Greek and the Italic. The two civilizations, Greek and Roman, split asunder, but the dominating element is still Mediterranean and Aryan.

Moreover a new process sets in: the West and Italy are getting ethnicised through the Ethnic Protoplasm of the invading barbarous tribes of the North, and the separation (Polyarchy) be-

comes intensified in the rise of many ethnic States.

Underneath all these manifold historic ups and downs, we are to note again the subtle dialectic of the universal State working in and through the particular State, which with time reveals its inadequacy and passes off the stage of the World's History.

VIII. Hellas shows a continuous unfolding out of itself till it was subjected by an outside power. This is a very important aspect of its historic character, and is unique in Europe. Undoubtedly it received outside influences, but it assimilated them completely. We contemplate in it a native and spontaneous growth, such as is found nowhere else so perfect. Its limit was that it could not associate autonomy, could not make truly institutional its own Polyarchy; it was going down under its own self-administered blows, when an external power seized the exhausted prey. Rome grew somewhat in the same way at the start, though she always showed an element of association. Finally she associated the Greek world with its autonomy, but never fully digested it. Greek Sicily called forth the Roman proconsular imperialism, which was the seed of the Empire planted already in the Republic. Rome thus becomes double with two civilizations, each reacting on the other, till the final separation into two Romes, a Latin and a Greek imperial City-State.

Much have we said about the kind of government called the City-State, and much more will have to be said about it in unfolding Ancient European History, of which it is the essential form always being transformed through the grand metamorphosis of historic occurrences. Now this City-State may be said to have its soul in its Law, whose ultimate purpose is to secure freedom to its people. The Law of the City-State will go through a long evolution from its start in Greece, till its outcome in the final organization of it by Justinian (in the *Corpus Juris*). First each little Greek City-State made or sought to make its own Law (autonomous); the result was a great difference of Laws throughout Greece — another manifestation of her division and conflict. The very Laws of the Greek communities collided and fought — the outcome of autonomy in its excess. But Rome, the Henarchy, first conquered and then subsumed the vast diversity of Greek Laws under one Law, her own as supreme Lawgiver. Thus not only Greece but all the world gets the consciousness that Law or Right (*Jus*) is or ought to be universal — which became in time the strong inner bond holding the huge Roman Empire together. Both Greece and Rome were City-States, the one being many and the other but one: this is indeed what they have in common. But in Rome autonomy is not the political characteristic. Rome

is not to be one nation with many Laws, but many nations with one Law. Thus she can associate other peoples with herself and with each other, and establish a system of universal justice between man and man over the civilized world. This inner fabric of her spirit remains to-day and still rules, while her outer fabric of empire has long since vanished.

IX. Thus we seek to bring before ourselves the total sweep of Ancient European History with its three stages forming together one vast process which rounds itself out to completeness. The Period comes into the mind as something finished; still that is not the end of it, but rather a fresh beginning. Its innermost nature is to unfold, to divide within itself, wherewith a new Period has started, forming a stage of a new and larger historic cycle. Out of completed antiquity is springing the medieval Period which will also wind itself up and become a stage of the larger process called European History. Here, however, we wish to note the power of History to periodize itself in ever-enlarging cycles, starting with its little round in ancient Hellas. Thus it is like the Self, or is a kind of Self or Ego, having the same ability of dividing within itself and then moving beyond into a new sphere, which repeats the same act. History is an objective self-consciousness working in the world yet corresponding to the subjective one in

me, who am to identify its processes with my own, and thereby truly know them. History thus is psychical, else I could never get it, for I can see it only in the light of the processes of my own Ego into whose form it must be ultimately taken up. To periodize History aright is to bring out and set forth the movement of this obective self-consciousness in historical events. The Period may therefore, be called the Soul of History, yea the very Self of it, whose evolution moves in cycles getting larger and larger, and seeking to embrace Space and Time in their sempiternal round.

Here, too, let it be said that we must conceive the evolution of the cycle to be cyclical, ever progressing indeed toward the end, yet ever returning upon itself, and thereby ever completing yet ever renewing itself in wider reaches. Very abstract all this seems doubtless, but the historic Period, which is a cycle of occurrences, finds therein its thought and final confirmation. We may repeat, accordingly, that the evolution of the cycle can only bring forth itself, namely the cycle as small, as great, and as greatest of all. So the historic Period does and must do, if it is to reveal the fundamental process of History.

It is manifest that historic Periodicity begins small in a small country (Greece) and has continued to produce greater and greater forms of

itself (or cycles) in Space and Time till the present day. After the Greek Period came the Mediterranean (circummarine); this was followed by the European Period, which again has showed itself but a stage of a still larger cycle (circumterrene) which embraces also Asia and America (pp. 67–70), thus rounding the globe. Such is a mere outward glance at the evolution of the historic cycle with its recurrent power of self-reproduction always widening out and transcending old limits.

Ancient European History is, accordingly, but a stage toward the end of all History, a stage in the movement of man toward a complete institutional world made actual in the State universal. The organized universe is to secure his freedom, his Self, but first he is to bring forth this organization, which is the long labor of History.

1. *HELLAS.*

To-day the Greeks call their country by the name of Hellas, which was in Homer's time applied to a small district of Thessaly, and then became already in antiquity the designation of historic Greece. Homer has, however, no collective title for the whole Greek people of his time, in fact he has no prevailing term to express the anti-Trojan side, the forces under Agamemnon, whom he variously calls Danaoi, Achaioi, Argeioi. We must note that the Trojans spoke Greek, had essentially Greek customs, Greek worship, Greek Gods. Really the war of Troy represented the great separation in the one Hellenic stock, that between Greek and Oriental, between Europe and Asia. The Tro-

jans were Hellenes with face turned toward the East, the Achæans, (whom we usually call Greeks), were Hellenes with face turned toward the West. The Trojans were Greeks orientalizing, whom the European Greeks had to put down, or lose their racial destiny. Homer, therefore, sings of the origin, not only of Greece but of Europe, and Europe has always heard this undertone in his song, which is indeed the deepest ground of its interest and lastingness.

In the Trojan war is the primordial division of the Hellenic nation as such, which therein begins to get conscious of itself. Homer is the singer who brings about this consciousness in his people, who through him really come to know themselves, and who ever afterwards will honor him as their spiritual hero, and recognize his two poems as the Hellenic Bible. It is Homer who separates Hellas from the Orient on the one hand, and on the other from the barbarous Ethnic Protoplasm of Europe. Thus the poet unites the Hellenic people, and is the chief training to a common Hellenic consciousness among a mass of communities and tribes otherwise wholly separative and self-repellent. It is Homer who nationalizes Greece and begins to Europeanize Europe. Still this common national consciousness has no common name in Homer, though we see him reaching out for it in

a number of directions. But in Hesiod it has appeared, and in Herodotus it has become historic. Then we begin to note a still more emphatic term, that of Pan-Hellenism, the spirit which looks to the interest of total Hellas in contrast with the narrow particularism of the one city or tribe.

It may be here noted that the term Greece comes to us through Rome and Latin literature. The Greeks never called themselves Greeks, at least not till Romans had introduced the usage. The national designation of the nation is and has prevailingly been Hellas. Still a large part of the common people at present call themselves Roman (or Romaic), which is a striking reminiscence of the power and sway of imperial Rome. During many centuries there was a Roman and a Romanized Hellas, which has left its stamp upon the popular heart and speech, as well as upon History. In fact the Turk once called his empire Rome (Roum), seeking to appropriate the name with the thing.

I. Greek History in its total sweep reaches from its first clear sunrise on the border between Asia and Europe in the sixth century B. C., till the taking of Constantinople by the Turks (1452 A. D). This brings before us the whole view of Greek spirit in its historic reality extending through a period of some 2,000 years. Politically this is the entire cycle of the Greek

City-State, unfolding first in its own independent movement, then passing through the great Roman discipline of subjection for hundreds of years, and finally obtaining its second independence as imperial City-State, which was in turn submerged at the beginning of the Renascence. Looked at from this point of view, the Greek City-State had a far longer life than the Roman, as the Greek tongue showed a much greater vitality than the Latin, being indeed spoken by the people to this day.

So striking and unique, and so little emphasized generally is this total sweep of Greek History that it should be more precisely set down and grasped. (I) Greek History as purely Hellenic which lasts from its opening till the Roman conquest in 146 B. C. This is usually the theme of the so-called Histories of Greece; in fact Grote's large work ends before this period is completed. (II) Greek History during the Roman's sway, or the History of Roman Greece; this extends from the preceding conquest till Constantine permanently divides Rome and founds the Byzantine Empire, which is Greek. (III) The History of Byzantine Greece thus opens with the new Hellenic City-State, now imperial, which lasts more than a thousand years longer.

Such are the three stages of Greece in its historic entirety, which stages we may name the

Hellenic, the Roman, the Byzantine. Note that the last stage manifests a return to the first in the matter of national independance. Byzantine Greece is in a sense free Greece again; the nation has received anew its own political autonomy, and is unified more completely than ever before in a political organism. And the City-State is still existent and energizing, though not as many (Polyarchy), but as one (Henarchy.) Thus we behold the great cycle of Greek History, having rounded itself out and concluded in a new external domination, not now that of the Roman but of the Turk.

It should be added however that the Greek nationality did not die at the taking of Constantinople, though losing again its independent political existence as it did in antiquity at the taking of Corinth by the Romans. It continued to live through nearly four centuries of Turkish oppression — in some parts of Greece the time was much longer — when it arose anew or a portion of it, and obtained what may be called its third independance, which in a few years more will celebrate its hundreth anniversary. This third free Greece has not shown itself the equal of the first or even of the second; indeed it came shudderingly near going into a new eclipse during the recent Greco-Turkish war. Still there is nothing in European History which can be compared with this perdurable political

vitality of the Greek people. The first civilized nation of Europe is still a nation even if small and in a small corner. And it talks substantially that same old Greek tongue in which Homer sang. The Jewish people, of West-Asia originally, have lasted quite as long and still last; but politically they have been outcasts from their own country and from nearly every other. Their religion is what has united and eternized their nation. It would seem that the Greek has shown a saving political instinct, and the Jew a saving religious instinct; each has furnished in his own way a most important element to the World's History.

The great cycle of Greek History, however, completes itself at the Fall of Constantinople, as it has to be regarded at present. Perhaps this is but its first finished cycle of some twenty centuries, after which the second great cycle of Greece has only begun, destined still to whirl through yet incalculable æons. So the modern Greek is inclined to dream, as we have heard him, being incited thereto by looking back at his nation's past, and its long deathless development.

To the rest of Europe Greece became an ideal with the end of the Byzantine Empire — an ideal possessing a creative, renascent power which gave name and spirit to that period called the Renascence. A new birth of Greece it was

in the European Folk-Soul, which went back to its civilized beginning and drank afresh of the original fountain-head of its culture. It would seem that every age, yea every individual, has in some way to go through that same round for his completed development, reproducing within himself the process of the Greek world. To be sure, Roman Greece and Byzantine as well, have, or have had hitherto no great part or influence in this total cycle of Greek spirit. Still, they belong to it and make it integral in its large sense. We are not to forget that Roman Greece, when politically under the yoke, taught and ruled her conqueror intellectually. Ideal Greece as complete is, therefore, the preceding historic cycle which the present real Greece may be conceived to have begun over again.

II. When we pass from Greece as historical to Greece as world-historical, we have to make a new adjustment. That is, the special History of Greece does not always coincide with universal History. Only once indeed did such coincidence take place supremely and entirely: that was the work of the first stage, the above-mentioned Hellenic Greece. It may be said that the World-Spirit was overwhelmingly Greek from Marathon to Chæroneia, yea till that fatal fall at the battle of Corinth. Then it was when universal History spoke and wrote Greek, when it thought, acted and felt in Greek. The State

particular and the State universal were essentially one during that time, and followed one end, even if they did sometimes fall out and get to quarreling, especially toward the last. Finally however, the great separation came and the World-Spirit took flight from Greece across the Adriatic and settled down in Rome, there to stay for the next supreme period of the World's History.

During this period Greece passed out of her autonomous Hellenic stage, and became politically Roman, not without exercising a strong educative influence mentally over her victor. But the new decree of the World-Spirit ran in favor of the associative City-State (Rome) as against the separative City-State (Greece generally), and even as against the federal City-State (Achæa specially). Moreover this World-historical transition from Greece to Rome has its historic voice, though still speaking Greek, in the historian Polybius.

With the rise of the Byzantine Empire, autonomy in a new sense returns to the Greek world after an obscuration of nearly five centuries, which last from its subjection to Rome till its restoration through Constantine. This third stage, Byzantine Greece as we have called it, performs also a world-historical function but by no means so intense, so original and interesting as that of the first stage, the Hellenic period. Through its long

duration of centuries, Byzantine Greece overarches the entire Mediæval time and forms the chief bulwark of Europe against the mighty surges of Mohammedan conquest. Again it fell to the duty of Greece to be the vanguard of the West in warding off the Orient—her ever-recurring historic task, which we first witness in her repulse of the Persian invasion at Marathon and Salamis. But it must be added that this her Byzantine work for European civilization has never received adequate credit from the historians of Western Europe.

It has been already noted that the impact of the Orient upon Greece as the European vanguard has been the mainspring of the periodicity of Europe's History. Three such impacts by three different races — Persian, Arabian, Turk — have taken place, and have made themselves the starting points of the three great historic Periods known as Ancient, Medieval and Modern. (See preceding pp. 118–121). Thus on the Greek borderland toward Asia has been drawn the main battle-line of historic Europe, whose civilization has lain behind it, with the Greeks on guard at the front against the Oriental onslaught.

III. Accordingly the first stage of Greece, the Hellenic stage or Hellas, as we may designate it specially, bears the unique stamp of the World's History, in which the individual State in time

and place becomes the supporter and the propagator of the supreme end of all History, the State universal. Now this Hellenic stage has its own process, reflecting the world-historical movement of all ages yet being peculiarly Grecian in its events and character, as well as in its outer local and temporal setting. We can conceive of it as lying mainly between two great deeds or strokes — the fore-stroke of the Persian culminating in Xerxes and the back-stroke of the Macedonian culminating in Alexander. The duration of this period from first to last may be estimated at about four centuries. More will be said upon its chronology later on, with a more precise division of its occurrences.

At present we wish to bring before the mind and to emphasize the idea of the historic round which this period, in accord with the meaning of the word *period* itself, unfolds and completes. It is manifest that that the invasion of the Persian was an advancing westward movement into Greece out of Asia, out of the very seats of the primal Aryan race, to which the Greeks also belonged. On the other hand the invasion of the Macedonians, who were an Hellenic branch, even if a less progressive one, was a returning eastward movement into Asia, which penetrated, before it stopped, to the orignal Aryan home, this being also the racial home of the Greeks, whence they had first migrated in antecedent

forgotten ages. Such is the outline of the total cycle of Hellenic Spirit, showing an historic return to its pre-historic sources, and revealing an unconscious arc of its existence complementtary of its conscious arc as uncovered in its History.

The Greeks, under Alexander, then, were not aware that they were going back home in their invasion of the Orient, that they were overcoming the millennial separation in the Aryan race, and thereby healing, partially at least, the bitter dualism so long existent between Greece and the Orient. Strangely, they did not know it; but, more strangely still, we do know it to-day, having learned the fact very recently through a new science, Comparative Philology (see p. 32, 33). The Greek and the Persian were both Aryan, and hence fundamentally were unilingual and uniracial. This deep unconscious unity of the two peoples Alexander seems to have felt; we have to think that it was upon this foundation that he proposed to build his great Greco-Persian Empire, spanning Europe and Asia, even to India, and embracing the total civilized Aryan race, East and West. Such a racial instinct we are inclined to attribute to Alexander, far deeper than his knowledge or that of the learned Greeks around him. A Hero he was indeed, not simply a Macedonian, or a Greek or even an European

one, but an Aryan Hero, through the depths of whose unconscious existence flowed a dark but mighty undercurrent of racial feeling, which finally became the controlling power of his thought and action. From history he has passed into the legend of the people both of the East and the West; they, after their fashion, have swathed his real exploits in many a mythical layer of miraculous deeds.

Alexander may well be deemed the greatest Great Man of Greek History, as conqueror and even as statesman, rising far beyond the narrow limits of the Hellenic City-State, Tribe or Nation. But concerning him and his work we shall have more to say in the proper place. Here we wish to put stress upon the basic conception of this historic stage of Greece, which is to be grasped as cyclical, having rounded itself out into a period through the return to the Orient in the Macedonian supremacy. Persia moving upon Greece since the time of her founder Cyrus, never won it; but Greece at last turned back and won Persia, penetrating therein to the primal source of its own racial being.

IV. The mention of the racial feeling in Alexander leads us to a consideration of other feelings which lay in the Greek Folk-Soul, and could become the strongest, even if often unconscious, motives to action. Every person is aware of having within himself a vast reservoir

of feelings, which may rise from unknown psychical depths to an overwhelming energy through some present stimulation, and which are really transmitted states of a long past existence. Quiescent, potential, transcended they lie in what may be called the Under-Self of every man, evolved as he is from countless generations; now asleep, but once awake, they can be awakened again at the right moment with the right provocation. The multitude of such feelings is very great; but Greek History compels us to take account of four specially, which often determined Grecian political conduct. These four native feelings, or rather four layers of them from lowest to highest, we may for our present purpose call the elemental sentiments of the Greek Folk-Soul, and hence immanent in every Greek man with more or less energy. Their gradation should also be noticed, as they rise in order from the profoundest abysses of the soul's unconcious past up to its conscious present.

(1) The Greek had a racial sentiment of Aryan kinship. Dark, remote, unconscious, this always remained, still it existed and could be brought into activity. Already we have intimated that the deepest fact in Alexander's career was his Aryan instinct. But the same feeling made itself operative in the early Greeks when they carried on their struggle against the Phenicians for the control of the great Inland Sea with its

future commerce and civilization. Jealousy, nautical and mercantile, there was, as well as the love of wealth and of domination; but all these motives were merely implements in the hands of a deeper power. The first marine City-State of the Semite, the Phenician, was supplanted by the Greek; the second marine City-State of the Semite, the Carthaginian, was destroyed by the Roman; both Greek and Roman were Aryans and dominated the secular life of the Mediterranean world. Still the Semitic spirit lived and was transmitted to the future through another channel, the religions, and therein reached a new supremacy.

The Greek then shared in the uniracial instinct of the Aryan, and could be brought to feel, even if dimly, a sympathetic oneness with his race. The last great historic act of ancient Hellas, the fusion with the Aryan Orient, had its underlying substrate in this sentiment, which, we repeat, remained unconscious to the last.

(2) The Geeek had a national sentiment of Hellenic kinship. This sentiment was manifest in the primal great historic act of Hellas, in the union of its diverse communities and tribes against the Persian, who had first roused it by his attack upon the Greeks of Asia Minor. We feel in the First Book of Herodotus already the strong undercurrent of national sympathy for the Hellenic brothers subjected to Oriental sway.

There was a word which came to express decisively this sentiment: the word *Pan-Hellenic.* The leader or the community was said to show a Pan-Hellenic patriotism in contrast with the narrow devotion to Tribe or to City. As Hellas never did or could organize itself politically into a Nation, but remained divided groups of small territories and cities, Nationality in consequence was not real but ideal, a sentiment of which there were various manifestations in religion, in the great national games, and in legend and literature. Homer may be called Pan-Hellenic, and he even speaks of the Pan-Hellenes, though in a strongly suspected passage (Iliad II. 530). Hesiod too has the word and the thing. The Hellenic Nation, in spite of separative tendencies, made itself valid against the Persian, but at last succumbed to the Roman.

(3) Every Greek had the tribal sentiment more or less strongly developed. Two tribes obtained great prominence in historic Greece — the Ionic represented mainly by Athens, and the Doric represented mainly by Sparta. The tribal sentiment is manifested in an unconscious but very interesting way by the historian Herodotus, who, a Dorian by birth and prejudice, celebrated largely Ionic exploits and even wrote in an Ionic dialect. Two other Greek tribes have historic significance, the Aeolic, which we find at the beginning, and the Achaean, which becomes promi-

nent at the close, of Hellenic History. Moreover the Achaeans were the most famous and influential tribe of the Homeric period, furnishing the larger part of the poet's epical heroes.

Besides these four historic tribes there were many other Greek tribes, particularly of the backward peoples like Macedonians and Aetolians, both of whom were called barbarians by the civilized Greeks but were certainly of Hellenic blood. It would seem that the tribal sentiment, though stronger than the national had a tendency to decline with advancing civilization, which still further divided the tribe, breaking it into fragments.

(4.) The Greek had the communal sentiment, that of the City-State, or of the civic community to which he belonged. This, indeed, was the strongest of all these elemental sentiments. Here we touch the characteristic political fact of Hellas, her strength as well as her weakness. Each little community must be self-governing within itself, independent of any organized association with its own tribe, nation, or race, more than a voluntary alliance. Autonomy was its consciousness, beyond which the Hellenic world was unable to develop historically. Not till it has passed through the long Roman discipline, could it associate politically even itself.

Such were the four sentiments, elemental, we call them, of the Hellenic period, source of mul-

titudinous conflicts which there was no organized State to suppress, or adequately to curb. The Ionic Greek let us take; he would fight on the sea the Phenician of another race; he would fight on land the Persian, of the same race but of a different nation; he would fight the Dorian on land and sea, of the same nation but of a different tribe; then he would fight most bitterly the City-State like Athens, which was of the same tribe and nation, but which sought to limit his community's autonomy in the interest of tribal or national union. The Greek has been known to take sides against his tribe, against his nation, and (in Sicily) against his race, in the interest of what he deemed the autonomy of his City-State.

V. There is no doubt, however, that the interplay and collision of these four sentiments — communal, tribal, national, racial — make Hellas the liveliest, most eruptive, and the most interesting chapter in the book of the World's History. But this was not the whole of Greek separation. The City-State itself, the seeming political atom, divided also within into parties, and became a scene of manifold civil strife which often ended in fraternal blood. The source of these parties was the struggle for headship transmitted from the Village Community — the struggle already alluded to as that between Monarchos, Aristos, and Demos (pp. 49–52). The Hellenic

City-State of History through its political parties wrought over and fought over thousandfold the three basic governmental forms — Monarchy (or Monocracy), Aristocracy, and Democracy. Moreover the Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle for instance, as well as the Greek historians, Herodotus and Polybius for instance, have transmitted a great quantity of theoretical discussion upon these three kinds of States, noting their excellences and defects, their good and bad forms.

At present, however, we wish to observe that the political party has a very important place in the historic destiny of the Hellenic City-State, and in a way cross-cuts with new divisions the four preceding divisions of the elemental sentiments of Greek life. An Ionic community under a democracy could have its government changed by a party within it invoking the aid of a Doric community under an aristocracy. Party spirit often was stronger than tribal or national ties. In the Peloponesian war Sparta would set up aristocracies instead of democracies in the conquered cities, while Athens would set up democracies instead of aristocracies, both methods being always supported by a political party in the community itself. Thus a change of the administration meant a change of the constitution. The Greek City-States as a body are seen diversifying this political round of Monarchy,

Aristocracy, Democracy in their good and bad forms, and interacting with one another in peace and war. Many a single City-State in its internal History goes through the same round more than once. Athens, for instance, in her varied career, went up and down the gamut of all three forms several times, and reported her expeience in each case.

The City-State however, under any of its political forms showed itself unable to associate the Greek Nation or even one of the Greek tribes. Athens never fully combined the Ionians, nor Sparta the Dorians. The only exception might be that small remnant of the Achaeans who at the sunset of Greece, formed the Achaean league. The communal sentiment was accordingly much stronger than the national or tribal. There was a reason for this to the mind of the Greek. He was not only a citizen, but often a ruler through his community; once beyond its bounds he was a stranger, an outcast without rights, having no institution to grant or to enforce them. As a member of the communal organism he obtained his whole institutional life. Hence if it was autonomous, he was autonomous, a freeman. Such was the limit of his political consciousness: the civilized Greek could not make a tribal State, Ionic or Doric, only the less civilized Macedonians could do that. Nor could he make a national State for the whole Hellenic people: still less

could he build a World-State like that of Rome, which had the power of uniting cities, tribes, peoples and even races.

The communal sentiment of Greece divides, or as it were, atomizes the whole land into autonomous communities. But now comes the fact alluded to already: each of these communal units is separated internally into three, or, more usually, two political parties, each of which becomes a means of affiliation with the same party in other communities. The result is that an external bond of union runs through all the Greek City-States, and gives an inner element of cohesion amid so much outer separation. Every Greek man, belonging to his own City-State, as not only distinct from but repellent of other City-States, belonged also to one of its political parties, was monocratic, aristocratic, or democratic in politics, and thereby became connected, to a degree, sympathetically, with the same party in every other City-State of Greece. For instance, the subordinate aristocratic party at Athens had always links of connection with the dominant aristocracy of Sparta and other City-States. The strong outside power, first Macedon and then Rome, largely swept away these interweaving threads of Greek political parties.

On the other hand the Greek through party could destroy and often did destroy all his native elemental ties. He could become anti-com-

munal, anti-tribal, and anti-national under the influence of partisan ambition or hate; uniting with Carthage, he could become even anti-racial. Such was the negative might of party politics in the Hellenic City-State, which was undone chiefly through this destructive spirit within itself and within the hearts of its own citizens. Still we are not to forget the positive side in this process: through party a bond of unity was established outside of the City-State, the Tribe, the Nation and the Race; a kind of political universality began to arise in the Greek soul just through the negation of the narrower elemental sentiments already designated. Thus the Hellenic City-State was getting prepared within for a higher governmental form than itself, and the Hellenic man was really training himself internally for an external domination over himself which was certain to come, as just that lay in the movement of the World's History, was indeed its next stage.

From the foregoing it is plain that the Greek Polyarchy of autonomous City-States is dissolving through its own inner self contradiction, since the spirit of it is getting to be no longer that of autonomy, but rather that of outside dependance, of external determination — a spirit which by way of contrast may be called heteronomous. Athens, Sparta, Thebes will seek to rule other City-States more or less through

inner parties, keeping for themselves the headship which the Greeks call by a special term, Hegemony. Finally the Macedonian will appear, who will rule through a final external authority, through armies and garrisons in the citadels of the City-States, even if he also employs political parties as a subordinate means. Thus Hegemony which still leaves a partial Autonomy of a party and is a varying compromise with it passes over into Heteronomy, which designates another law over the Greek City-State than its own. Philip of Macedon is a logical evolution of the Hellenic Polyarchy, which has become in spirit heteronomous: each City-State, getting its law from others or seeking to impose its law upon others, has really lost Autonomy and has generated Heteronomy, which now steps forth on the Stage of History from the outside, embodied in the Macedonian monarch. His authority is no longer that of one Greek City-State over the other or an Hegemony, which still tampered with Autonomy. Really the Polyarchy of autonomous Hellenic City-States, having become many heteronomous City-States within Greece, calls up the one incarnate Heteronomy coming from the outside. We are to see that Macedon and then Rome are born inside of Hellas, as well as outside of it; in fact they get their historic purpose and win their historic career through this corresponding inner development of Hellas.

The three designated terms or categories— Automony, Hegemony, Heteronomy — are of Greek origin and show the inner movement of the Greek mind and hence of its historic evolution. They can be put together in various ways and their interplay weaves largely the many-colored fabric of Greek History. Autonomy and Heteronomy were represented by Greece and Persia at first; they fought desperately, calling up for help the Spartan and then the Athenian Hegemony. Athens, however, gradually transformed Hegemony into Heteronomy. (See Thucydides *passim*, but especially the Melian dialogue toward the end of Book V.) Therein she deeply violated the Greek political principle and her own too, for which the Persian war was fought. Sparta likewise in the Peloponnesian war, arming Autonomy, gets the Hegemony of Greece, and then lapses into Heteronomy. Thebes also went through quite the same process. So the Greek Polyarchy through its own inner self-undoing generates the Henarchy, whereof the special historic events will be touched upon later.

VI. Another sentiment which began to make its appearance early in the Greek world was the cultural. This divided primarily all mankind into Greeks and Barbarians. The Orient with its civilization to the Greek mind was barbarous, till Alexander and his successors, in part at least, obliterated the line; the same feeling pre-

vailed long against the Roman conqueror. Homer has the word as applied to the manner of speaking, and it designated originally a foreigner trying to talk Greek. From language it passed as a badge branding all culture which was not Greek.

This cultural sentiment divided not only the non-Hellenic, but also the Hellenic stock into civilized and barbarous. Thus the civilized Greek despised and disowned his uncivilized kin, the backward peoples of Northern and Western Greece. And these returned the contempt and hate. The primordial Ethnic Protoplasm of Greece still existed in historic times, and the civilized City-State was sent back by the World-Spirit to take a fresh dip in its original fountain, when it had become degenerate. It cannot be doubted that there was a certain restoration of fresh energy to later Greek life through the Macedonians, Epirots, Aetolians. These were rude but uncorrupted members of the Hellenic stock, belonging to that Proto-Hellenic or perchance Pelasgic layer of primitive humanity once covering the whole Greek peninsula, and reappearing dimly but persistently at various points throughout historic Hellas. Thus the Greek civilized man had to be re-baptized in his own genetic stream, and so get a new lease of national life. Barbarism too has its purpose in the World's History.

To be sure, he stormed and scolded enough about having to take that unpleasant dip. But it was his saving discipline, even if it wrecked his beloved autonomy. Greece still lived and performed its world-historical task, not now political, but cultural. That proud civilization, which held, in the language of its greatest thinker, Aristotle, that all barbarians should be the slaves of the civilized man, namely the Greek, is compelled to serve just these barbarians, and to exist by imparting its civilization to barbarism. And we shall find that all the nations of antiquity, ruling for a time but growing also in corruption, are sent back to the barbarous Protoplasm of Peoples, to take that same dip. Macedon had to have her turn, and finally Rome herself, greatest of all, was immersed in the recreating stream of its own original barbarism. For the Teutons who destroyed the Roman Empire, were Aryan kindred of the Romans and of the Greeks.

Here again rises to notice that Ethnic Protoplasm, which we have already observed lying behind ancient European Civilization, and at intervals rushing down into it with a violent savage hostility. Ever present to the Greco-Roman world was the dividing line between the two sides, that rim of barbarism, encircling the Mediterranean peoples and threatening them like an external Fate with a tragic outcome.

And yet all these peoples had sprung from this same Ethnic Protoplasm, to which at last they have to return for a renewal of national life. So the presiding Genius of History, the World-Spirit, uses the barbarous nations as a kind of plastic material to mould at first and then to re-mould ancient civilization when decayed (see pp. 36–40).

VII. A characteristic of Greece is the unusual number of Great Men it produced — in the present case, political or communal Great Men, who were leaders of their City-States, specially against the Orient, and thus were not only defending Greece, but were safe-guarding and even producing future Europe. Hence Europe and her children have taken good care of the fame of these her ancestral protagonists. Each was filled with the World-Spirit who had decreed the separation of Europe from Asia, and who had called forth the first European political form, the Polyarchy of City-States, autonomous indeed and separative, yet capable of a common Hellenic sentiment.

Now the statesman of this City-State is to bring his people and their little community to do the world-historical deed, which is at the same time national, or Pan-Hellenic as it is called. He is to rouse in them the Greek patriotism, elevating them beyond their narrow communal, or even tribal sentiment and filling

them with their larger destiny. In other words the Great Man of political Greece must mediate the World-Spirit with the Hellenic, yea with the communal Folk-Soul. He thus becomes a World-Man, though perchance belonging only to a little community, which, through him is made to participate in the movement of the World's History, and in so far may be called for the time a World-State. Undoubtedly the most brilliant instance of such a man and such a city was Themistocles and Athens in the Persian War.

From this point of view we can see why the Great Men of Greece were so many. They tallied with the number of autonomous City-States, each of which had to have its leader, its mediator. The World-Spirit had called up the Polyarchy of Greek City-States, which required a corresponding Polyarchy of Great Men to mediate them with itself. For each little community as an independent and self–asserting unit had to be mediated with the whole nation composed of such units, whose end was that of the World's History. Such was the lofty work and the grand opportunity of the political individual at his best in Greece; which accordingly became more prolific of Great Men of the State than any nation since.

The very fact th .t there was no actual governmental unity of the Hellenic people, but simply

a society of autonomous City-States, led to this unique development in the number of Great Men. One large united country is usually governed by one or a few prominent individuals, to whom the other administrators are subordinate. But in Hellas not one or a few but many tapped the World-Spirit and received its direct baptism. Moreover they came all at once, or in a brief period of time. Rome produced also many Great Men, but they have on the whole a tendency to be successive rather than synchronons, and to rise in a line down her long history.

Another point of abiding interest in the Greek heroic characters is that they were communal and appealed and still appeal to every man reading of them in his own little community. To-day the biographies of the Great Men of Greece are taken as furnishing lofty human examplars by the people, and by orators and writers speaking to the people. The vast majority of individuals still live in the community, even though this be now but a little fragment of a mighty Nation-State. Behold what the merely communal man made himself in his small Greek institution: he became world-historical, the bearer of the World-Spirit. To be sure the modern community is not what the ancient was, and cannot furnish the same career for greatness. The Greek City-State is thus a kind of ideal for the ambitious man, and also stirs the common senti-

ment of national patriotism, even if there be no institutional association of the total Hellenic nation in one political center.

So we may put this matter together in its largest outlook: the World-Spirit elevates the little Greek community into a World-State through the communal leader, who thereby becomes a World-Man bringing forth in his age the World's History. Nor must we fail to note the biographer of these antique World-Men, Greek Plutarch, heroic in his way among his heroes, writing a World-Book which the people still read with delight and instruction. In a kind of double gallery of heroic shapes he brings before us the Greek and the Roman World-Men, with their deeds and destines.

And now we have to note the dark side in the picture of Greek Great Men: they all collide in one way or other with their City-State and many of them perish in the struggle. Having become Pan-Hellenic in sentiment and in action, they no longer fit into the limits of their little institution. When their great national deed is done, they have to sink back into their small City-State with its narrow life, and so have no political reality corresponding to their new character. Each has belonged also to some party, which is assailed by the other party, and in these partisan struggles the Great Man of Pan-Hellenic mind gets banished. The ostracism meant that the

small City-State became too small for the Great Man whom it had reared; it cannot mediate him in a time of peace, cannot keep him within its pinching institutional limits. But when divorced from his community, the ancient Greek was an outcast, there was no Pan-Hellenic State in administering which he could satisfy his feeling and exert his talent.

So the Great Man of Greece shows the tendency to become tragic through his greatness. Deeply significant of the time is the fact that Athens rears a group of poets who have in a supreme literary form portrayed the tragedy of the Greek Hero ideally, but have at the same time imaged therein the ever present fateful reality overhanging the Great Men of their city. The Prometheus of Aeschylus is such a transcendent character carried up into the Olympian community itself, the City-State of the Greek Gods. In like manner the Great Man of Greece collides with his institutional limits, being as yet unable to transform them into the new order. Verily he is prophetic of the destiny of his own City-State, which is also tragic in the movement of the World's History. It bursts its confining bounds as autonomous and goes down after fulfilling its world-historical mission.

VIII. The Hellenic City-State showed a mighty power of self-reproduction, which was manifested in its colonization. Greece at a certain period

was the greatest colonizer known to History, surpassing even England which probably stands next. This colonizing period in its widest limits may be said to lie between the two great wars, Trojan and Persian, both of which were waged against the Orient. The Iliad and the Odyssey, which are based upon the Trojan war are indeed not strictly historical, still they show a social and political condition which was real. In this sense the Homeric age begins Hellenic History. At that early time there seems to have been no colonization of the City-State, though tribal migration lies in the background. Indeed the City-State, as we know it later, has not yet fully appeared in its manifoldness though it is appearing in a kind of sporadic fashion.

The Doric invasion of the Peloponnesus, called also the return of the Heracleids, is often said to have given the first strong impulse to colonization. This invasion, stated by Thucydides to have occurred eighty years after the Trojan war, caused a great tribal dislocation throughout Greece, which began in consequence to throw out colonies in all directions. There took place a grand central explosion which flung colonial City-States outward to the four points of the compass from continental Hellas. We find that the displacement had a tribal substrate, as the peoples of the four best-known Greek tribes moved to separate localities, the

members of each tribe hanging together in a kind of cluster. For instance, the Æolians, the Ionians, and the Dorians in part, went to Asia Minor and the adjacent islands, each tribe taking its own slice of territory. But the Achæans of the Peloponnesus seem to have moved westward, especially to Italy, in whose Greek colonies the tribal spirit was not so pronounced as in Asia Minor.

Still the unit of colonization was not the tribe but the new community, the rising City-State. The chief characteristic of the Greek colony was its political independence, it was born autonomous. The mother-city (metropolis), which sent it out, claimed no authority over it, though there was usually a strong affection between parent and child, which found its expression in certain religious ceremonies. The two sometimes fell out and made war upon each other, as Corinth and Corcyra, but such a condition was regarded as unnatural. Thus autonomy overslauged the tribal as well as the national sentiment. Every Ionic city in Asia Minor was independent of the rest as well as of the mother-city, Athens, though they all had a common tribal festival and religious meeting-place called the Panionion. Such was the case also with the cities of the other Greek tribes. The distinctive thing which they all had in common, yet which separated them all, each from each, yea,

which often antagonized them, one against another, was the sentiment of autonomy.

The colonial movement was the product of central or continental Hellas where was first developed the nation, and which has remained its heart through all the long ups and downs of History till to-day. The Trojan war seems to have first nationalized the Greek peoples, whose previous condition was that of an Ethnic Protoplasm nationally potential, realizable, but as yet, unrealized. The work of the Achaean leaders under Agamemnon united Greece against Troy and its Asiatic tendency. The poems of Homer kept this nationalized consciousness alive, which rose above tribes and communities, filling them with their great national end of Hellas versus the Orient. The colonial movement, however, was essentially communal, and had the tendency to break up the tribe and subordinate the tribal sentiment to the community as City-State, whose completed evolution lies in and through colonization with its mighty genetic energy.

The autonomous City-State of Hellas, therefore, was State-bearing, and in this capacity reproduced itself in its colony, namely an autonomous City-State. And so the process went on: the daughter bore daughters, who were of the same nature. Miletus, an Ionic colony, is said to have been the parent of eighty colonies. This marvelous procreative power of the Hellenic

City-State was not a sudden outburst followed by a cessation, but it continued hundreds of years, four or five hundred from first to last. Indeed it was the most striking phenomenon of the early historic epoch of Hellas. During this time the City-State was engaged in the bearing of States of its own strain; such was really its world-historical function, in which it manifested the peculiar Hellenic phase of the State universal. Throughout History the generation of the State particular indicates specially the presence and the working of the State universal, which is thus seeking to realize itself.

The colonies formed the outer rim of Greek civilization against barbarism. An irregular dotted circle of these colonial City-States surrounded the mother-country on every side. The curious fact comes to light that they soon rose above their source, growing to be greater and more prosperous than the original cities. Sybaris, in Italy, was probably the greatest city that ever existed of the Grecian name, holding sway over Italic peoples from sea to sea. But it was destroyed in 510, B. C., after two centuries of power, by the neighboring Greek City-State of Crotona. Miletus was the largest Ionic city till it was overwhelmed by the Persian not long after the destruction of Sybaris. Thus we see a rise, bloom, and fall of the Greek Colonies, both in the East and the

West. Colonization itself, that wonderful reproductive power of the Greek City-State, substantially ceased about the same time with the Persian assault upon Greece.

From the foregoing account it is evident that Greek colonization has an unique character, differing from every other kind known to History. The Roman colony was essentially a military post in an enemy's country, and always was in strict dependance, politically, on the mother country. Of course, associative Rome could not produce an autonomous City-State. When Athens later sent out colonists similar to the Roman, they were called by a new name (*klerouchoi* instead of *apoikoi*). In modern times Spanish colonization had no element of autonomy. The English colonization of North America had in it a decided communal element like the Greek, but its autonomy remained partial, for it did not cut loose from the home government at first. A religious independence rather than a political lay in its original conception; particularly was this the case in the settlement of New England. But the Greek colony on the other hand maintained its religious connection while severing its political connection with the mother country.

The Greek colonists, on setting out from the mother-city took a brand of its sacred fire from the Prytaneum, (Town Hall,) after having con-

sulted the Oracle, (usually the Delphic) and obtained its approval; they also had a chosen founder (oikistes) who was worshipped in it as a hero. The colony was undoubtedly an outlet for political and social discontent, a field for adventure and for money-making, a vent for the young aspiring spirits, who habitually chafe against the older set and their authority. The result was the colonies shot rapidly ahead of the mother-cities, exploiting backward peoples of their own stock in Italy and Sicily, as well as in Asia Minor. Thus the colonies had a number of special ends, which can be recited, but their supreme, universal end was world-historical, the development of the Greek City-State, which is now evolved out of the protoplasmic Village Community through colonization. But this outward or colonial movement having performed its function, the World-Spirit will return to central Greece, and manifest itself in a new and even grander historic development.

Migration is dominantly of the Tribe, while colonization is dominantly of the City-State, which carried along into its new home the primal political divisions of Monarchos, Aristos, and Demos. The consequence was that the Greek colonies presented a varying panorama of party struggles, with a bent toward a democracy, or rather toward a governmental form based on a property qualification of its citizens (timocracy.)

Law-givers also arose — Pittacus in Lesbos, Charondas and Zaleucus in the West. Finally the Pythagoreans in Southern Italy obtained extensive political authority, starting at Crotona. They represent the philosopher as ruler in advance of Plato's *Republic*. An exclusive aristocracy of doctrine undertook to govern the whole state after its pattern and failed, bringing bloody requital upon itself. Certainly an oligarchy of intellect can be as imperious as that of birth and can stir up as great animosity — a fate which hangs over the Platonic scheme.

It has been noticed that Greek civilization moved from continental Hellas along with the colonies and dwelt for centuries in the borderland. The fact must be emphasized that Greek science, art, philosophy first distinctively arose in the Greek colonies, not in the central mother-country. The first philosopher of Greece was Thales of Miletus; he seems also to have been the first scientist, if he could tell what caused the eclipse of the sun mentioned by Herodotus. Almost contemporaneous with him philosophers appeared in the western colonies, Xenophanes and Pythagoras, both of them founders of independent schools. Philosophy, accordingly, first arose and flourished on the colonial border, from which it passed to the central city, Athens. (See our *Ancient European Philosophy* pp. 70, 205.) The same thing is true of Greek Archi-

tecture: its earliest national development took place in the colonies, in the Ionic of the East and in the Doric of the West. The names of the two chief Greek columns and their orders have been taken from the places of their colonial origin: Ionic and Doric. (See our work on Architecture, pp. 172-7.) Thus Art, Science, Philosophy, History, had their first flowering in Europe on that colonial border of the Hellenic world-garden, from which they have been transplanted through the ages, having never really died out from that day to the present. To be sure, this peripheral bloom did not last permanently, it was finally extinguished by outer conflict and inner strife. But from the Hellenic border of many City-States it passed to the Hellenic center of culture, to the one City-State, Athens, where took place a new and far greater and more perfect efflorescence of Hellenic spirit. From Athens in turn resulted a second centrifugal movement, not now colonial but cultural, which spread through the whole ancient civilized world, and is still spreading at the present moment.

IX. The general character of physical Greece has been already set forth in its two main predicates: peninsular and insular. The territory is thus primarily divisive, particularized by Nature into many small lots which are ready to be occupied by many separate communities. Perhaps

no country in the World is so completely partitioned off within itself by natural walls of mountain and water. On the face of the land is written: this is the appointed home of the autonomous City-State.

Moreover through this division there will arise correspondingly many such City-States, a cluster or society of them, or as we have called it, a Polyarchy. Thus Greece is the prelude, the symbol of modern Europe, which is to-day a Polyarchy, but of Nation-States. At the same time we are not to omit the opposite trend: Greece is of one race, of one tongue, of one religion, of one nationality. With all its divisions, it has one political norm, the afore-mentioned City-State. Thus we are likewise to note at the start a native undercurrent toward unity, which has been designated as its Henarchic bent, and which will show itself throughout Greek History in its many leagues, alliances, Amphictyonies, Hegemonies, even Tyrrannies — wherein again we may observe a remarkable foreshadowing of modern Europe.

Having carefully noticed this face of Hellas so deeply partitioned and bulwarked by Nature, we may next observe the primitive mass of humanity flowing down into it, and divided by it into many separate communities. Such was the Proto-Hellenic stock or Ethnic Protoplasm which Greek Nature is not to make, for it is already

made, but rather is to mould into its communal form. These migrating peoples bring with them their primitive institution, the Aryan Village Community, which is here to undergo a transformation into the Hellenic City-State. Not at once is the great change accomplished, of which we can perhaps still discern faintly three stages: one in the time before Homer, one in Homer, and one in the age after him, the colonial age.

At present, however, it is in place to note the other early influence which goes to make the Hellenic City-State. This was the civilized influence coming from the river-valleys of the Orient with their culture and institutions. Already on the Nile and Euphrates had arisen the fluvial City-State (pp. 168, 175), which had developed a high stage of civilization. Also the marine City-State of the Orient had come up in Phenicia (pp. 170–5), and was in bloom while Hellas was in its infancy. Many elements of culture streamed out of the Orient already getting old, into adolescent Greece, and schooled it into line with the movement of civilization from Asia into Europe. Thus the World's History is continuous, a connected evolution in time and place, even if some of the lesser links are missing. To be sure, the Greeks claimed to be autochthonous, sprung of the earth, but their territory was only one strand in their genesis. Greek speech distinctly tells of their Aryan

origin and relations, while Greek legend in many a poetic shape shadows forth their spiritual connection with the Orient.

But the main point now is to see the three primordial elements of Hellas coming together and forming a process whose outcome is the autonomous City-State as the representative of the World's History. (1) There is the basic separation of physical Hellas into island and peninsula, the arena provided by Nature for her historic career. (2) Then comes the protoplasmic overflow of the original Hellenic stock into this insular and peninsular mould, which determines it externally first and then internally. (3) We must also mark the Oriental contribution of civilized life, for that Proto-Hellenic stock, though already separated from the Aryan mass in Asia, is still uncivilized, and outside the stream of the World's History as recorded and recordable. Art, science, navigation, even the letters of the alphabet move from the Orient into Hellas, which transforms them after and into its own character. Especially the political institution, the City-State, is to pass from an all-dominating autocratic Henarchy to the autonomous Polyarchy of Hellas. The World-Spirit is to be seen, with the historic eye, leaving the Orient and settling in Greece where is to be taken the next great step in the movement toward realizing the State universal.

X. Before passing into the details of Greek History, its periodicity will have to be considered in a brief outline. Let us say in advance that it, as a stage or part, must show the process of the total historic cycle already set forth; such is its deepest periodic nature. Of course the reference now is to the History of what is usually called free Hellas or of Hellenism proper, as distinct from Roman and Byzantine Hellenism. This original native Hellenic State lasted in our judgment till the battle of Corinth (146 B. C.). To our mind independent Hellenism even as civic did not cease with the battle of Chæroneia (338 B.C.), as is often said, though it was in the decline after that defeat. On the other hand, historic Hellas reaches back to Homer, or to the Trojan war, the time of both being uncertain. If we take the dates as ordinarily given, the Hellenic Period will last over five hundred but less than a thousand years. Centuries even are not very definite in this early twilight, but thought will be fairly satisfied in calling the extremes by the names of their greatest reporters, Homer and Polybius, both of them Greeks, and writing in Greek at the beginning and end of the native historic Greek Period.

We may recall that the History of Greece, being political, turns upon the governmental form, which is the autonomous City-State in its rise, bloom, and fall. Now Greece has many other

sciences besides political science, and has likewise many other kinds of history as that of art, poetry, philosophy. The World's History deals specially with the evolution of the State as manifested in historic events; so Greek History shows a particular form of the State going through its process in manifold occurrences of Time.

It should also be repeated that the conflict of this Greek City-State for its existence and development is with West-Asia, which has a different governmental form. In and through Greece takes place the grand separation of History, that between Orient and Europe. The process of Greek History, as lying within the above-mentioned limits, reveals itself in its leading stages somewhat after following outline.

(1) *Early Hellas*, which may be called also Proto-Hellenic, in which Hellenism is budding but has not yet flowered forth. The City-State is moving out of the primitive community into its historic form. The first great conflict within the Hellenic stock arises and is fought out, through which conflict (the Trojan War) Hellas is nationalized. Then it is tribalized and finally colonized—which brings up the next stage, which has from the start been the potential principle—the inner Hellenic germ driving forward to its flowering and fruitage.

(2) *Autonomous Hellas*, in which the City-

State blossoms out into a great multiplicity (Polyarchy), and forms a society of free-acting independent City-States—the peculiar inner separation of Hellas. At the same time takes place the outer historic separation between Orient and Europe in the Persian War. When this is ended the society of City-States turns inward and begins to rend itself (Peloponnesian War), conflicting with itself and at last undoing itself. With this inner self-negation of Autonomous Hellas, an outer hand is getting control of it (Philip of Macedon), and Autonomy passes through Hegemony into Heteromony.

(3) *Macedonian Hellas*, whose essential fact, to our mind is the return of Hellas and the Hellenic stock to the Orient whence it originally sprang—this return being the work of Macedon and particularly of its Great Man, Alexander. There is also a return of civilized Hellas to its protoplasmic peoples in and through Macedon as well as the vaster sweep backward to the Aryan fountain-head. Still the Hellenic City-State is not destroyed but subordinated, in this larger movement, to a far reaching end. It will start up afresh in the time of Alexander's Successors, and show a new life for a while till absorbed by Rome. Nor should we forget that the civilized Greek people, decayed and perchance dying, receive a restoration through this double baptism of themselves into their own uncorrupted Ethnic

Protoplasm, as well as into that of their primal Aryan ancestry.

Such is the total round of Hellenic History till Hellas becomes Roman, and hence a part of Roman History, when it is no longer World-historical, having completed its cycle and shown therein its deepest affinity with Universal History. Three stages we have noted in this process, each of which in turn will have its process as an intimate and indeed genetic part of the one great historic Whole. In the total sweep of the World's History, Europe represents the second or separative stage (See pp. 68, 102, 122 *et al.*) Europe may be deemed Asia particularized, cut up into particular States and remaining such essentially. Greece manifests strongly this European trait at the start by its group of particular, separate City-States, its Polyarchy. Such is the Hellenic prelude of European History, but this prelude has its own historic completeness, which is next to be considered.

SECTION FIRST.

Early Hellas.

The limits in time of what is here called Early Hellas cannot be exactly laid down. It is the vague Proto-Hellenic world moving out of its primitive condition into the definite institution of the City-State in continental Greece. The collision with the Persian Empire is what brings to completeness the latent character of this City–State, which, blossoming out in the Hellenic colonies of Asia Minor, was subjugated and smothered by the stronger Oriental power. Autonomy then did not assert itself victoriously but had to wait for its European development. Still it distinctly began not in Europe but on the Anatolian coast, probably in Miletus where we first plainly hear the thrill of that mighty Occidental word, Democracy. Thence it will pass to the mother-city, Athens, and reach its greatest ancient fulfillment, after having traveled back to its source.

Early Hellas, then, as a whole, may be taken as the becoming of the Hellenic City-State, the movement of it ere it has fully become. Its crowning act can be placed in its successful resistance to the hosts of Persia, whereby it vindicates its cardinal principle of autonomy, and

steps forth in its own right and might into the arena of the World's History. We are to see the original Hellenic protoplasm of tribes and peoples surging upon the Aegean sea on both sides doubtless, sweeping around it and over it into the Greek peninsular and insular territory, which begins to mould them and their institutions, especially their political institution, the Village Community. Of course they have other institutions, family, phratry, clan, tribe, common to primitive peoples; these they retain indeed, but the stress of their institutional development concentrates upon their political form already so often mentioned. The primal condition we may well deem to lie in the peculiarity of their physical environment, which is their matrix, though the plastic material as well as the artist must come from elsewhere.

The fact should here be noted that the Hellenic stock as a whole does not undergo this transformation; the backward portions of it never fully unfolded into the City-State, even in later historic times. The Aetolians and Acarnanians always remained more or less Homeric, and the Pelasgians in their scattered fragments seemed to be even pre-Homeric. Some tribes, especially those remote from peninsular and insular Greece, and belonging to its Northern and Western parts, appeared incapable of advancement. Probably they were never broken up and

particularized by Nature, but remained massified in their barbarous condition. So the Hellenic stock streams through the historic skies like a comet with a long tail gradually vanishing till it passes into the invisible. Yet the center is very bright and is connected with the one cometary body. Herein we may likewise behold the limitation of the Hellenic stock: it had no national unity, which embraced and looked after the lagging members. The principle of autonomy, good up to a certain point, becomes a system of communal selfishness which at last undermines itself and calls for an external power.

Early Hellas has in it a process which gives to it the character of a period. The first definite note of it we catch from the song of Homer, which fundamentally portrays the separation between Europe and the Orient. After the Trojan war follows an uncertain billowy time of much tribal wandering and dislocation, all of which produces division with new adjustments in continental Hellas. Then comes the colonizing epoch, whose primal manifestation is the return of tribal Greece to Asia Minor (it first went thither in the Trojan epoch,) whereby the Hellenic City-State attains to its earliest distinctive reality. At the same time through these three stages, Homeric, Migratory and Colonial, there runs the varied development of Monarchos, Aristos and Demos, producing a

shifting play of governmental forms which will be transmitted into the coming period of Hellas. At present we shall look somewhat more fully at each of the foregoing stages.

I. *Homeric Hellas.* Though Homer be a poet and mythical, he is also in the deepest sense historical, and begins Greek History. First of all, the institutional world which he portrays is a fact, the first fact of Greek History, out of which this must be seen to flow. What may be called the Homeric State could be verified still in the backward tribes of Greece during historic times; indeed it exists to-day. Also the social customs, the economic order, the religion depicted by Homer, were historically real, though many of the incidents introducing them must be regarded as mythical. Formally, Homer is not history, though his kernel is. Now the fundamental historic fact set forth by Homer is the separation of the Hellenic stock into two tendencies, that of Troy and that of continental Greece, which is the prelude of the still greater separation into Orient and Europe. The Greek and the Trojan were essentially alike in speech, customs, religion and institutions generally; still they represent two different ethnic tendencies, the eastward and the westward. Thus has arisen the primal struggle for the Hellenic heritage of the future; the European Greeks win it and raze Troy. Pre-Homeric Hellas was on both

sides of the Aegæan, round which lay the old Proto-Hellenic stock after its migration from Central Asia, which had already lasted many centuries doubtless. But Homeric Hellas divides from Asia and becomes European, leaving there behind it a lot of backward members of the old Aryan migration, which will show in the later historic ages a great capacity for becoming Hellenized.

Another result of the Trojan war was the nationalization of European Hellas, as far as it ever was a nation. That is, a national sentiment arose, fostered ever afterwards by the reading of Homer. A common enterprise temporarily united the centrifugal Greeks; the feeling was never lost, though it never resulted in a common political organism. The Homeric world showed a kind of loose authority in Agamemnon, who also by his own right bore wide sway over lands and cities and even islands. The cities of golden Mycenæ, and Argos, and Tiryns had arisen in one small district, the primal cluster probably of Hellenic City-States; but the City-State as autonomous was not yet the all-pervading Greek political principle, even if it was sporadically dawning. Institutionally considered Homeric Hellas was still in the stage of the Village Community, though coming out of it in the most advanced portions of the Hellenic stock.

In the scenes on the plains of Troy we see the working of the political institution in a number of instances. The Greek hosts were gathered there from many different quarters of Greece; but they all showed a common institutional instinct and made all together one city with its political organization. There was the *agora* (assembly of the people), the *boule* (the council of elders) and the chiefs, the kings endowed with a hereditary right of authority, yet requiring some sort of assent and co-operation from the two other constituents. The first thing to be noted here is that a peculiar form of the relation between Monarchos, Aristos and Demos, has appeared; all are present and exercise certain rights, yet the main word and the main power belong to the Monarchos.

This political norm of Homer, as we may call it, is destined to undergo great changes hereafter in its three elements. In a way monarchy, aristocracy and democracy are all present and at work, and are using their instruments. We behold a grand display of oratory before the People (see for instance *Iliad*, Book II) in order to rouse their latent sentiment or to stir the Folk-Soul which is the real performer of the great enterprise. The Homeric chieftain has to be a speaker as well as a doer.

Homeric Hellas has been transmitted to futurity in two world-poems, which are still in a solid

manner performing their original task—the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The point to which attention may here be drawn is that these two poems represent a dualism in the Greek world of Homer's time. The one shows the Greeks leaving home and country in European Greece for the great cause which has united them in the enterprise. The other shows their return to home and country after the destruction of the hostile city. Thus the two form a whole, a cycle, with its two arcs, separation and return. Through such a deed the national consciousness of Hellas is born and becomes at least a feeling. Before the Trojan expedition there was hardly more than a tribal mass of Hellenic stock, without the sense of nationality though this was already evolving, and had reached the point of rendering such an expedition possible. But perhaps the most interesting fact is that the Greek had already conceived of the cyclical movement of occurrences and had ideally portrayed it in the two masterpieces which open and forecast the spiritual history of Europe. (For a fuller statement of the cyclical movement of Homer see our commentary on the *Odyssey* pp. 511–534. The author may be permitted to refer to his works on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as supplementing the foregoing very meagre account of Homeric Hellas).

II. *The Post-Homeric Migration.* So we designate the important movement after the

Trojan War, which movement can be often taken a connecting link between the Mythus and History. There was likewise a pre-Homeric Migration, already often spoken of; but the present Migration, occurring later than Homer, has nothing to do with the Orient, as it is confined to the Greek peninsula till it bursts out of it and beats upon other lands. It has the appearance of a great inner agitation and displacement of the continental Greek tribes, something like a whirling maelstrom of peoples produced seemingly as some consequence of the Trojan War.

The whole Migration (often called Dorian, but it is much more) is a dark, half-mythical half-real affair, yet duly recorded and surely belonging to the historic process of Early Greece. Its character is deeply separative, if not explosive; Greece after the mighty effort outwards at Troy, seems to turn back upon itself, and to start a great fermentation among its tribes before suppressed or not yet ready to burst out. At any rate this movement is essentially tribal, in contrast with the Trojan movement which developed rather the national sentiment. Moreover the Achaeans of the Peloponnesus, who led the grand expedition against Troy and furnished so many of its illustrious heroes, are now almost swept away, a few remnants only being left in fameless corners. To Argos and Sparta the Dorians come, supplanting the old glories; of

this new people only once mention is made by Homer casually in a passage of the Odyssey. Almost no mythical honors are theirs; in fact they seem to blast that wonderful blooming Mythus of the Argive land into the dry fact. Poetry quite forsakes golden Mycenæ and the hollow vale of Lacedemon, fleeting elsewhither in Hellas.

It is interesting to note, however, that this invasion of the Dorians was called a return — return of the Heracleids to the home from which they had been formerly expelled by the Pelopids.

Such is the poetic conception which is made to transform this prosaic affair: the leaders of these Dorians from a little district in Northern Greece claimed to be the sons of Hercules returning to redress the wrong done their ancestors by the sons of Pelops, among whom were Agamemnon and Menelaus and other Trojan heroes of Homeric fame, as well as the distinguished queens, Helen and Clytemnestra. But the Dorians coming down into Pelop's isle snuffed out all these legendary splendors with a kind of Laconic terseness, though they too connected themselves with legend in the backward time, even with that of Hercules.

The Dorian movement seems to have been the leading one and to have caused many other tribal displacements. The remaining Achæans, being driven northward to the shore of the Gulf of

Corinth, started the resident Ionians to moving, who passed thence to Athens and Attica, where they flourished marvelously. This must be deemed the main result of the present migration: the Dorians and the Ionians, substantially unknown to Homer (he mentions each of their names but once in his two poems) become the two chief tribes of historic Hellas, and constitute its deepest inner dualism, which produces as a result repeated wars, the most terrible one of all being the Peloponnesian. Evenmore emphatic than the political, is their spiritual difference. Athens and Sparta are recognized as tribal representatives and protagonists respectively of Ionism and Dorism.

Other dislocations of tribes and tribal fragments took place throughout Greece at this time, the details of which need not be given. One other important historic tribe now formed was the Aeolic, which soon betook itself in large numbers across the sea to Asia Minor. The Achæan remnant we shall hear of again in the last stage of free Hellas.

The present Migration, accordingly, gave vent to the tribal sentiment, and broke into the national sentiment which had been crystallizing during the Trojan time, under the leadership of the great Achæans. Homeric kingship also was on the decline, passing into oligarchy repeatedly. Pheidon, the famous monarch of

Argos, seems a kind of transition from the older Homeric king to the later tyrant. The Village Community was evolving into the City-State, but had not yet reached its full polyarchic bloom.

The act of Migration, though tribal, in a very powerful way weakened the tribe, which in its new form took up within itself many fragments of the older conquered inhabitants. The Aeolic was undisguisedly a mixed tribe, its name means *changeful* or *variegated*. Also the Doric and the Ionic admitted numerous foreign elements of various kinds. Artisans, tradesmen, small proprietors of the soil, the free-hired worker and the slave even, all of diverse origin and station, began to form a class together, the new People, heterogeneous but getting united, against the homogeneous ruling aristocracy. The former Homeric Demos is undergoing a change through this tribal Migration, and becoming a People which cannot have much tribal sentiment, and can share strongly the communal sentiment, that of the City-State, which is arising.

So we are to grasp the fact that in and through this tribal migration, the tribe is getting shivered into fragments, and these fragments are reuniting into an order or class which is not tribal. The Demos of the historic City-State of Hellas is being formed, which though called Ionic or Doric or Achæan, is, especially in the colonies,

much mixed. Tribal conflicts among the People we read of as occurring in various places, for instance at Cyrene, which calls-in a foreign lawgiver, Demonax of Mantinea, to settle its troubles. In the City-States of continental Greece, the Demos was doubtless more purely tribal; still even the most powerful one, the Demos of Athens, was inclined to eschew the Ionian name, though it would appeal to Ionism for a political purpose.

As a planet might burst into a thousand pieces, each of which becomes a new planet, so the migratory explosion of central Greece flings out on every side its multitudinous City-States, especially the colonies — which process we are next to look at.

III. *Hellenic Colonization.* The general character of the Hellenic colonies has been already set forth (p. 220). The City-State reproduces itself sending off its children to distant lands, not however as dependent but as autonomous. The very time of such colonial reproduction of the City-State is also the time of its origination and development in central Greece. Thus the self-production of the Hellenic City-State goes hand-in-hand with its self-reproduction. Colonization in its present form comes after the Trojan War, and starts out of the foregoing Migration, which it succeeds; but with the incoming of Persia it gradually declines.

Backward or tribal Greece did not and seemingly could not colonize; it could only migrate tribally for it had no developed City-State. That portion of the Hellenic territory which may be called civilized or central Greece had the power of bearing colonies, of reproducing new City-States, of which two kinds may be designated from this point of view, the originative and the derivative, the latter becoming in turn originative and sending forth fresh colonies.

The earliest great colonial act was the movement of the three tribal groups, Aeolic, Ionic and Doric, to the coast of Asia Minor and its islands, where they formed three successive clusters of autonomous City-States. To this act much significance is to be attached. In the first place the movement though colonial, had still a tribal migratory element, and thus showed a transition from the preceding stage, in which it continued to participate. We see in it the tribe breaking up into independent City-States which however, remain tribal, and form tribal unions, not political but religious. In the next place these colonial City-States reveal an advance over those from which they were derived; new Miletus for instance very soon distanced its old Athenian mother. Through the colonies the City-State took a step in development which was not taken in central Hellas till this colonial progressive spirit came back and reconstructed its original

home. This happened before their spirit was crushed by Persian conquest, which destroyed their autonomy and with it of course their creative power of colonization.

It should also be emphasized that in this going over to Asia the Hellenic stock turned back upon itself, upon its former stage, and thus rounded out the present stage of its career. Through this Asiatic colonization Greece returned to Troy and to the country of the chief Trojan adherents, not now for the purpose of suppression and destruction as in the former deed, but of reconstruction and development. There is no doubt that these colonists were for that time the bearers of the coming civilization, bringing with them to Asia the new City-State. The grand separation between Greece and the Orient, whose primal act was the Trojan war, receives now its first overcoming and healing, to be repeated many times in the course of the World's History. And we may catch a glimpse of a still deeper return. The peoples of Asia Minor (see them in Homer's catalogue, Iliad Book II, Karians, Lydians, Mysians, etc.) were chiefly backward members of the Hellenic or Aryan stock, to whom this colonization has brought a new message. They begin to get Hellenized, which means their future civilization.

Such is the colonial return out of Europe to Asia after the Trojan separation, completing the

cycle in the history of Early Hellas. But this was not the only direction of Greek colonies; they also went westward to Italy and Sicily, southward to Africa, and northward along the inland seas. Thus was formed the colonial rim around central Hellas. Upon this rim Hellenic history properly begins and therewith European civilization. Not in the center, but on the circumference we are to seek for the origin of Greek Art, Science, Philosophy. Lyric poetry rises and flourishes in the colonies, being the product and expression of the new City-State, in contrast with the Epos of Homer, which is rather the utterance of the Hellenic Nation in its primal unity and greatness. But the chief matter is that old Greece is reborn through the new, and especially old Athens inherits the intellectual gifts of her daughter Miletus.

As already said, Hellenic colonization lasted several centuries and was accompanied by numerous other occurrences. In the new City-State the Greek tyrant often arose, so that the tyranny became a common governmental form of the time. He was the monarch, yet not the Homeric king. His genesis was mainly as follows: Monarchos by the help of Demos puts down Aristos who was the previous ruler, and then rules in his stead. The new Demos of the young City-State, being heterogenous tribally and otherwise; finds a leader against the homo-

geneous close aristocracy, which seeks to keep all authority to itself, and so loses it. The bloom of the Tyrants is placed at 650-500 B. C. Then follows a decline, but there will be a new appearance of them in the Macedonian period, though originating from a different cause and in a different insitutional world.

In the colonial period arose also the famous individual Lawgivers whose general scope was to put all parties of the City-State under the same laws. *Isonomia* became one of the common categories of the time, truly inspiring and welling out of the popular consciousness. For it was the Demos, of the three political parties of the City-State, who demanded equality before the Law against the privileged Aristos, and against the tyrranical Monarchos. We find the prevailing sentiment in most Greek writers who speak of the matter, that democracy means a government of Law, in contrast with the privilege of an aristocracy and the caprice of an autocrat. The City-State of early Greece thus called for the Lawgiver, perchance even Lycurgus, whose time and career and works are all very uncertain, according to his ancient biographer Plutarch. Solon, the Athenian Lawgiver, is the typical one, as well as best known, since he first and most completely made democracy legal and permanent in Hellas.

The great institutional transition of the col-

onial period in central Greece was that of the Village Community to the City-State. Aristotle and other Greeks knew of this transition very well, and designated it as the change from the *kōmē* to the *polis*, of which Athens herself furnished the earliest and best-known example. It was the capital act of the Athenian hero Theseus, to merge several outlying independent Attic villages into the one Athenian City-State. Sparta, however, always refused to unite the several villages of her central city, and to surround them with a wall till late in her history. In fact it became the policy of Sparta to prevent such communal consolidation of Hellenic towns, as the strong centers offered greater resistance to her arms. Before and again after the Persian War she sought to hinder the uniting and the walling of Athens. At a later period she tore to pieces the City-State of Mantinea, dividing it up again into original component villages. But she had to witness on her own immediate border the formation of the Great City-State (Megalopolis means this) by Epaminondas, who thus placed as a sentinel at her very doors the peculiar Greek institution of which she had shown herself such an enemy.

It was a recognized characteristic of the backward Greeks (marked by Thucydides and other writers) that they still lived in scattered, unfortified, and hence unfixed villages, ready to move

not only their cattle and goods, but their community, their communal organization, at the appearance of danger. Such were still in historic times, the Aetolians, the Ozolian Locrians, and in general the peoples of Northern and North-Western Greece. They remained migratory, protoplasmic, tribal purely, for we must distinguish between the early tribal migration and the later tribal migration of the City-State, which as Aeolic, Ionic and Doric went over to Asia Minor, and which was likewise the first disintegration of the tribal spirit. Here, however, we are to note that Sparta remained the protagonist of the migratory period of Hellas which seemed to be her ideal, and was always more or less averse to the new development of the City-State in the colonial period. Spartan spirit in Greek History was thus a regressive, reactionary one, chiefly directed against progressive Athens.

Somewhere about 600 B. C., Sparta began to be recognized as the strongest state of Greece in a military way, and thus to gain a certain pre-eminence, among the many weaker powers. The embassy of Croesus (about 547 B. C.) which was sent to solicit Greek aid against Cyrus, found the Spartan Hegemony already established and acknowledged by the rest of Greece. This supremacy is traceable to one main source: the Lycurgean discipline, which made men as strong and hard as iron, but also

as unformable and unprogressive. But on the other hand, while this Greek crystallization was going on in Sparta and her followers, there was the opposite movement, namely Greek development of the City-State both in central and colonial Greece. Sparta and her institutions had the merit of serving as a fixed rallying-point for the total Greek nationality, naturally ebullient and centrifugal. Other unifying elements appeared in the present period: the great national games headed by the Olympic festival, the Pan-Hellenic influence of the Delphic Oracle which favored colonization and often commanded it, the rise of a common art, literature, science. Moreover the Greeks were united by things which they did not quite as much as by things which they did: they did not practice polygamy like Asia and many rude tribes of Europe, they were in law and instinct monogamous — a fact which preserved their basic institution, the Family, and transmitted its character to future Europe. No human sacrifices, no degrading mutilation of the human body, no selling into slavery their own children, no castration; on the contrary an inborn love of the human frame, which made it revered and a subject of their plastic art, and thus a fit abode of the Gods; hence, too, their delight in the naked display of the limbs of athletes at gymnastic contests — a thing disgusting to the Orientals and perchance to us moderns.

Such, then, is the creative energy of what we here call the Greek colonial period, truly a time of prolific institutional productivity. In it and out of it that most peculiar Greek institution, the City-State, was definitely born and grew up to maturity, both in its derived (colonial) and its originative (central) forms. It begot the early Tyrants, and also their counterpart and corrective, the early Lawgivers. But its greatest manifestation was its State-producing power, which is to remain a supreme test of all political forms coming down through History till the present.

A remote colonization of Greece, pre-Homeric and pre-historic, is often mentioned. Greek legend has celebrated certain famous immigrants from the East—Cadmus, Danaus, Pelops—whose birth places and names have suggested colonists from Phenicia, Egypt, Asia Minor. But this is no more than a mythical acknowledgement of that Oriental influence which formed one strand of Greek civilization, and which has been already indicated to the reader.

Under the head of Early Hellas we place, accordingly, three important stages of Hellenic History—Homeric, Migratory, and Colonial. These, though overlapping at the edges, follow one another in their general sweep, and also form a process together which gives as its result the distinctive political norm of Hellas, whose historic movement we have now reached.

SECTION SECOND.

Autonomous Hellas.

After the preceding period of Early Hellas, we behold the City-State in full bloom, evolving under many different forms its deepest political character, which is expressed by its word *autonomy*. Moreover there are many of these autonomous City-States — Hellas is now their Polyarchy. Still further, these independent bodies constitute a variety of groups or clusters, according to locality, tribe, party, but the cluster is not to jeopard autonomy, each remains a bright particular luminary shining by its own light and moving in its own orbit. The Greek world has become a heaven full of stars, separate indeed, but forming many constellations. And yet they all have ultimately the one law, and are going together round the one great cycle of historic fulfillment. All of them rise, shine in their glory, and then set, as if they were placed in some universal frame work, or we might say, in the frame work of the universe, which is indeed more than they. In fact this Greek Polyarchy of autonomous City-States is but a phase or stage of the World's History, and is performing its part under the guidance of the World-Spirit.

There springs up now the first great fight over the Greek peninsula, not merely for its external possession, but for its future spiritual inheritance, which is nothing less than Europe. Asia longs for it as for her other half; Persia at present desperately grasps after it, deeming her destiny unfulfilled as long as that self-sufficing Greek City-State confronts her with its defiance, and places a limit upon her unlimited power. Clearly universal Asia (for that is her consciousness) must subordinate particular Europe, else she cannot be universal. Especially must this particularized Greece be put down; otherwise it will come over to the Asiatic world imparting its principle. So the historic conflict between Orient and Europe opens with an appalling outlay of strength and energy on the part of Oriental peoples.

In fact the Greek peninsula may be deemed the pivot of the World's History for nearly twenty centuries. Orient and Europe have swept backwards and forwards over its territory, seeking to possess it as if their existence was bound up with its possession. Who owns Greece? has been a chief historic question in the past. Persia, uniting all Western Asia, sought to overbear it by huge avelanches of humanity, but was completely foiled — thus History definitely starts. Then Alexander from that same peninsula smites back and fells to the earth the huge antagonist.

Rome gets it too, but with it gets the principle which will finally cleave her in twain. Long was the struggle of the Mohammedan who labored for it many hundred years, and finally won it through the Ottoman. But that same Greek peninsula is at present being slowly wrested from his grasp, though he as yet holds the pivotal city — Constantinople. Europe is still not done with the problem of the Greek Peninsula.

The ancient Greek Polyarchy, however, will show itself inadequate, it cannot unite and nationalize Hellas in a State. The result is that its counterpart and fulfilment, the Henarchy, will always make itself felt somewhere in a destructive way. The movement of autonomous Hellas with its Polyarchy lies between two Henarchies: the Oriental or Persian, which is not to take Hellas, and the Greek or Macedonian Henarchy, which is to subordinate the autonomous galaxy of City-States and then Persia. At the same time the Henarchic principle is underneath the total Polyarchy, as well as within each member of it, fermenting more or less negatively. Thus autonomous Hellas will be dissolved internally as well as smitten externally.

In the Trojan War we saw a separation in the Hellenic stock, the two sides being generally called Greek and Trojan. But in the Persian War the separation is far deeper and more primeval; it goes back to the Aryan race, to

which both Greek and Persian originally belonged — the one being Hellenic and the other Iranian as to stock. Thus we behold a racial dualism with its struggle. Moreover the dividing line of this struggle is drawn essentially between Europe and the Orient, wherein lies the separation between two continents, which separation now distinctly enters the World's History. There it is to remain, often reappearing as the battle-line on which are fought the supreme conflicts of the ages.

The Orient first attacks and subdues the derived or colonial City-States of Asia Minor, and of the Greek islands. Then it passes to grapple with the original City-States of central Hellas, from which it is compelled to recoil. We shall see that the Greek Polyarchy of Asia Minor could not be the bearer of European civilization; it was too Asiatic, it endured tyrants, it had no leadership or hegemony and no true leaders for the movement. By three different Oriental monarchs it was assailed and subdued — Crœsus, Cyrus, and Darius. The colonial expansion of Greece, especially to the East, impinged upon the Oriental limit, and called up the conflict which the mother-country had to settle. Then one of its City-States (Athens) turned back upon Asia and freed the Greek colonial cities in that region, but at the same time founded an empire of her own. This

Athenian empire is the source of the next great historic movement culminating in the Peloponnesian War, and undoing the Polyarchy of the original or continental City-States of Hellas. Such was the inner dissolution that called up the external power of Macedonian Philip.

It may be said that Autonomous Hellas with its struggling atoms is seeking for something which it cannot find or is unable to realize. The sentiment of nationality is ever-present and working, but autonomy thwarts its fruition on every side. The Greeks aspire for, but cannot make one nation of themselves; that would be Henarchic, and they are Polyarchic above all things. So Greek autonomy is tragic, is indeed the all-including Greek tragedy of tragedies. Such is the dramatic movement and outcome which we are to witness in the world-historical play of Autonomous Hellas. The solution, however, has in it an element of the *Deus ex machina;* the Polyarchy, unable to save itself, is saved by the interference of an outside power, which is indeed no true salvation. At any rate autonomy is lost in such a rescue, though it remains as the strongest Greek sentiment even under the hand of suppression, and bubbles up now and then into a partial and fleeting reality till Rome finally snuffs out the flickering light of Autonomous Hellas.

How to periodize this movement is quite a

problem. It is full of events, which springing out of a hundred different places, show much variety and no little contradiction. In fact autonomous Greece produced more History than any other country ever did in the same length of time, more than Greece herself did in the rest of her entire existence lasting twenty centuries and upwards. The present period will cover somewhat more than two hundred years, being reckoned from Crœsus who had subjected a number of the colonial Greek City-States of Asia Minor (some years before 546 B. C.) till the death of Macedonian Philip (336 B. C.) who had subjected the most of the original Greek City-States in Europe. Between the two foregoing dates lies the History of Autonomous Hellas, which, however, must be seen to have many minor divisions and processes.

There is another fact about Autonomous Hellas which should not be overlooked at this point. During the period before us the writing of History blooms forth quite suddenly and attains a degree of excellence which on the whole it has not since equaled. The judgment of the ages has pronounced Herodotus and Thucydides to be the greatest of all Historians, including ancient and modern. They are great not so much by their intellect as by their theme, which opens European History and gives to it the character which it has ever since maintained and unfolded. They

not only write History but create Historiography in deepest response to their time, which has truly reached the full historic consciousness and demands an adequate utterance in the written word, whereby the worthy deed becomes the possession of the race for all futurity. Autonomous Hellas is, therefore, not simply historical but typically historical, giving the original pattern and prototype of succeeding European History. The record of it seems to have a kind of creative power, reproducing itself in many examples modeled after these two originative Historians of Autonomous Hellas.

But neither Historian covers the entire field of the Greek City-State in its autonomy. Herodotus shows the first stage of it; Thucydides the second stage (and not the whole of that); while to these two must be added a third stage whose record has to be put together from many diverse sources. This brings us again to the question of periodizing the present historic sweep of two centuries and more with its multitudinous and intricate mass of events. Let the following be taken as a preliminary outline which is to be filled up later with further details.

(1) In the conflict with the Orient the Greek Polyarchy of City-States is externally triumphant in European Greece after having been put down in Asiatic Greece. Thus the derived or colonial City-States of Asia Minor lose their autonomy,

while the original central City-States preserve theirs against the Persian attack. This is the Hellas of the Greco-Persian War till the peace of Callias, and it is spanned by the first Hegemony of Sparta. Briefly we shall designate this stage as *Autonomous Hellas triumphant* — whereof the historian was the Father of History himself.

(2) In the inner conflict with itself the Greek Polyarchy of City-States becomes an agitated mass of ever-colliding atoms, which gradually negative themselves in their self-trituration. This is the Hellas of the Peloponnesian and subsequent wars, till Philip of Macedon begins to enter the Greek system of City-States. Now the original (not colonial) Hellenic City-States destroy each other internally and also their entirety as Polyarchy. Autonomy perishes as Polyarchic by its own inherent self-negation, moving through Hegemony intoHeteronomy. Not only Autonomy but also Hegemony collides with itself and goes to pieces. *Autonomous Hellas in conflict with itself* will be the subject of this second stage, which was principally recounted by Thucydides, and after him by Xenophon and others.

(3) In the conflict with Philip of Macedon, the Greek Polyarchy of City-States is externally defeated and subordinated to another law outside of itself both as particular and total. This outer law is now prescribed by a single will; Autonomy has thus evolved a principle stronger

than itself—Heteronomy. Philip comes to Hellas and is Hellenized on the one hand; but Hellas is also transformed, Philippized (to use a Greek expression often applied to certain Greeks at this time and even to the Delphic Oracle). Really however we are to see that the age, the World-Spirit is Philippizing, not simply some individuals or a party. *Autonomous Hellas subordinate* is the statement of the fact of this stage.

Thus the new Heteronomy, as we may call it in contrast with Oriental Heteronomy, which the European Greek Polyarchy put down at Salamis and Platæa, is triumphant over Autonomous Hellas. The latter, though still struggling and effervescing spasmodically, passes into another period, that of Macedonian Hellas. Between the two Heteronomies, Persian and Macedonian, Autonomous Hellas has unfolded in triumph, bloom and decline. So the present historic process may be looked at and characterized from the preceding point of view as (1) Heteronomy defeated by Autonomy, (2) Autonomy self-undoing, (3) Heteronomy triumphant, to be sure in a new form, which pre-supposes and indeed takes up into itself the autonomous City-State of Hellas. Thus we see that the principle of Heteronomy, or Henarchy really overarches the free Greek world, returning back to itself and establishing itself, not indeed as Persian but as Macedonian.

I. *Autonomous Hellas Triumphant.* Or we

may say more fully, that the Greek Polyarchy of autonomous City-States vindicates itself against the Oriental Henarchy, which seeks to extinguish it in the interest of absolutism. Or since we call Hellas *autonomous*, we may call the Persian Empire *heteronomous*, seeking to impose its law or its will upon the Hellenic world from the outside, without the latter's consent.

The present period extends from the attack of Crœsus, king of Lydia, upon the cluster of Greek cities in Asia Minor (some years before 546 B. C.) through the whole Greco-Persian War till the peace of Callias, made by the Athenians with the Persian king, Artaxerxes, about 450-49 B. C. Thus the struggle between the two sides lasts about a century, when the Greek City-State not only in continental Hellas but also in Asia Minor is acknowledged autonomous by the Oriental foe.

It will be observed that this last peace involves both kinds of City-States, the derived (colonial) and the original (central). And in the interrelation between the two kinds lies the deepest thread of the historic process of the present period. The colonial City-States of Asia Minor were subjected by the Oriental monarchs completely after making various attempts to throw off the yoke; then the Persian advanced to subject the central City-States (European), and was overwhelmingly defeated and driven out of

Europe back to Asia, where the war on him was kept up by Athens, till he granted autonomy to the colonial (Asiatic) Greeks also in the aforesaid peace of Callias. Thus in the great conflict of Hellas with the Orient we observe three stages which together constitute its inner process: the colonial City-State is conquered, the central City-State is attacked but repels, and then this central City-State goes back and restores to autonomy the colony. Metaphorically we may conceive it thus: the daughter is ravished by the Orient whom the mother, being assailed, vigorously beats off, and then goes to the rescue of the daughter. Such we may deem the round of these hundred years of Hellenic conflict with the Orient. The three given stages we shall notice separately; very brief we shall have to be, in comparison to the enormous amount of History which has been written upon this period.

(*a*) Greek History, and for that matter European History in its eminent form and purport, opens in the Greek colonies of Asia Minor colliding with the Oriental monarch Crœsus, who seeks to crush their autonomy. Here the two conflicting principles of Asia and Europe appear in their earliest historic act, and continue in one guise or other to this day. The fact is emphasized by Herodotus, the father of History, in a notable passage alluding to Crœsus: "Whom I myself know to have begun doing wrong to the

Greeks, him I shall point out," Crœsus being "the first of the barbarians that subjected Greek cities to tribute" (See Herodotus Book I. c. 5, 6). At this point then, historical Europe definitely begins and never drops its thread of continuous evolution. To be sure there was some History before this, but it was fitful, not clarified, commingled with other ingredients, especially with the mythical element, as has been already noted in the account of early Hellas. But the grand separation between Orient and Europe, which we have already designated as the recurring principle of the periodic divisions of European History (p. 118), took place first on the borderland of Asia Minor at the time now before us.

Over and over again we have sought to formulate the thought of this conflict, to which we have often to return as ultimate. We can call it from one point of view the struggle between the Greek Polyarchy and the Oriental Henarchy, or from another point of view the conflict over Autonomy and Heteronomy, or simply between freedom and despotism. Hellenic nationality also asserts itself strongly against subjection. A still different and deeper-searching point of view is that of the State universal, which is the end of all History, and of which both the Persian and the Greek are but stages or particular manifestations, and hence must vanish with time into some higher

form (pp. 41, 54, 55). This last kind of glance is the fundamental one, and is what we must attain if we are to see with the World-Spirit.

Thus on the coast of Asia, open to the attack of its despots we behold three small tribal Polyarchies of autonomous City-States in their first bloom. Now this is just the principle to which the Orient is hostile and which it must assail if it is to make itself valid. Moreover we see here that History begins—the continuity of History as European. The two political shapes like contending athletes, enter the historic arena—the small autonomous, separated City-State of Hellas and the colossal consolidated Despotism of the Orient. The Historian (Herodotus) also appears to give some account of this wonderful new birth, that of History

Three Oriental monarchs are brought before us, grappling with their problem, the subjection of this new political order wholly opposite to theirs. Crœsus the Lydian, Cyrus the Persian, then Darius also Persian, attack and finally conquer one by one these free Greek Communities incapable of co-operation. The account brings to light the weakness of the Greek political consciousness, and even foreshadows the disease of which it will finally perish.

Still it should be noted that there is one Greek who is a statesman and who, foreseeing the outcome, gives some advice which reaches far be-

yond his time. Thales, known also as philosopher and scientist, advised "the Ionians to constitute one general council at Teos, the center of Ionia, while the rest of the inhabited cities should be governed as independent states." Thus a central authority should have charge of external affairs, while each city internally should remain autonomous (See Herodotus Book I. c. 170 for this earliest gleam of the idea of federalism).

The struggle between these Greek City-States of Asia Minor and the Oriental monarchs was long and fluctuating. No less than four different conquests of them are enumerated by historians, since they kept revolting at every good opportunity. At last the great rebellion from Persia took place, usually called the Ionic revolt (about 500 B.C.), which ended with the capture and destruction of Miletus, the chief Ionic City-State (496 B.C). Colonial Hellas, or more accurately East-colonial Hellas, seemed to sink down despairingly under the Oriental monarch, Darios, who now gets ready for a fresh assault upon the Hellenic world.

(*b*) Persia, and along with her all West-Asia now advance to put down central Greece, the original home of the subjugated colonies of Asia Minor. Thus the Orient will have wiped out the rising western nation which has already challenged its supremacy, and introduced a wholly new and opposite political principle into the

World's History. The Oriental State can properly tolerate no other State different from itself; it must seek by the very nature of its consciousness to obliterate the newly attempted separation from itself called Europe, which Greece has started. Moreover that separative Greek tendency, which we have called Polyarchy with its autonomous communities, means death to the Oriental principle of universal empire, which Persia has largely realized. The question has arisen with all its concentrated power: which shall hence forth control the World's History, Orient or Europe? From this fact comes the abiding interest of the old Greco-Persian War for the whole Occidental world down to the present. It was our fight, the condition of our being at all.

One-sided are our sympathies in this ancient struggle, and we cannot help ourselves; still we must seek to put our mind on the Persian standpoint also, and to penetrate if possible, to her instinct in such an enormous outlay of effort. She was of Iranian stock and possessed what is usually deemed the geographical center of the Aryan race, in the Highlands of Middle Asia. Of this race the Greeks were likewise an offshoot though much further removed than the Persian, who seemingly stood nearest in derivation to the primeval mother. So the interrogation comes up: Was Persia trying, perhaps instinctively to pre-

serve the Aryan unity, deeper than national, in thus attempting to overcome the Hellenic and therewith the European separation in the one common race? Prolonged, colossal, and in a way heroic was her endeaver, we might almost say her sacrifice; was it not to realize an ideal throbbing in heart, a great racial unity? There is no direct historic ground for any such interpretation of her action, still the thought is suggested by the common Aryan speech of Hellas and Persia—something deeper than their national or even continental separation.

But otherwise was the decree of the World-Spirit. The separation had to take place in the grand evolution of the World's History, and could not be suppressed by the Oriental Henarchy from the outside. Later in Europe the Greek separative tendency will be met and for a time overcome by Rome—whereof a good deal will be said hereafter. Also we may here note in advance that the foregoing instinct of an Aryan unity between Hellas and Persia will again arise to the surface, not from the Persian but from the Greek side, in the case of Alexander the Great.

The typical conflict between Orient and Europe takes place when a Persian army passes out of Asia into Greece for the purpose of conquering Athens. The result is Marathon, the most significant and far-reaching and indeed prophetic battle ever fought. The one small

City-State defending its freedom represents not only Greece but Europe and all the future. The vast Oriental mass of men is met by the organized individuals of a single community, and is driven back to the East. Marathon draws explicitly the dividing line between historic Europe and Asia; the difference between them previously was hardly more than potential. The most important turning points of European History will in a manner repeat the Marathonian struggle down to the present day. Very distinctly does the World-Spirit make its appearance at Marathon and utter its decree. Moreover the world-historical individual comes to the front at the right moment, incarnating the World's History and realizing its mighty Presence in his act. This is Miltiades, who is the Great Man standing at the node of the new æon, and mediating it with his people.

And yet Persia, intent upon her principle we have to think, does not and cannot give up at one repulse: she cannot with her consciousness see the coming destiny and yield. So she summons all her forces which include total West-Asia along with Egypt, to suppress the new menace to the Orient. Ten years after Marathon (480 B. C.) the son and successor of Darius tries anew to subjugate that Greek City-State on the continent of Hellas. Xerxes has rendered his name immortal by the most colossal failure

in History, for it would seem to have been greater than that of Napoleon's Russian campaign. Entire West-Asia is prepared, gotten together in an army, and hurled against Greece, which now unites a certain number (by no means all) of its City-States against the Oriental foe. Again it is the mass, the Asiatic mass, probably the largest mass of the kind ever collected into an army, in a struggle with individualized men and communities. Particularly on the sea does organized skill make itself valid. Naval History opens decisively with Salamis, and the new world-historical hero is the Athenian Themistocles, under whose genius Athens becomes the first great sea-power as conqueror, for the Phenicians have no Salamis upon their record.

After four battles, says Thucydides, meaning probably Thermopylæ and Salamis in 480 and Platæa and Mycale in 479, the grand Persian invasion of continental Greece ended in a complete discomfiture of the assailants. The Greek fleet went northward and captured Sestus and Byzantium on the European side, thus putting the sea-line between Europe and Asia, and emphasizing their separation, which was indeed the supreme result of the war. Orient and Europe are now twain, and stay so henceforth through European History up to date.

But at this point another problem has arisen, which directly connects with the future of

Hellas. Over yonder in Asia Minor are many Greek cities still under the sway of the Persian: shall we cross the sea-line and free them too? They are loudly and quite unanimously calling for their beloved autonomy, and are offering aid with men, ships and money. Upon this question the new separation takes place; the Athenians say yes, the Spartans say no. The result is Athens is taken as leader of the new confederacy whose primary object is to emancipate Asiatic Hellas, while the Spartan commander Dorcis, who is sent to take charge of the allied fleet, has nothing to do but to return home with his few Peloponnesians (477 B. C.). Thus the former Spartan Hegemony is split, the new Athenian Hegemony has appeared, and the Greek world is divided between Sparta and Athens, land-power and sea-power, Dorian and Ionian, aristocracy and democracy, conservatism and progress. Still the dualism has not yet become acrid, but will become so with the years. Sparta allows Athens to build her walls, to recruit her navy, and to establish her imperial authority, with some protest but no decided opposition, as long as she is engaged in the work of liberating the Greek cities of Asia Minor.

Accordingly the East-colonial Greeks are to be freed of Oriental domination. Here we should stop to note a corresponding fact: the West-colonial Greeks in Sicily are also engaged in a

struggle with the Carthagenians, an Oriental people, probably by agreement co-operating with the Persians of the East. Thus around the rim of the Hellenic world the Orient is surging and smiting, evidently for the purpose of breaking down this new limit to their rule, yea to their consciousness. The result, however, was similar. At the battle of Himera in Sicily, said to have occurred on the same day as the battle of Salamis, Carthage was overwhelmingly defeated by Gelo of Syracuse and his Greek army.

(*c*) The final act of the historic process which has been named *Autonomous Hellas triumphant* is now to be recorded in the deed of Athens, the original City-State, which crosses the sea eastward and frees the colonial or derived City-States of Asia Minor and the adjacent islands. This is primarily a re-creation of their autonomy, which had been crushed by Persia; well may it be deemed a second birth of the East-colonial Polyarchy of City-States, Ionic, Doric and Aeolic, whose first birth has been already described in their primal colonization. A period of return and restoration it is from this point of view; Athens, having vindicated her own autonomy, goes forth and restores that of other subjugated City-States, which are thus brought back to their first freedom. Her deed, however, produced a bisection of Central Hellas, as already indicated; Sparta and the Peloponnesians hold

aloof, while the one City-State acquires a supremacy of her own, particularly a nautical supremacy.

At the same time we are to see that the old colonial Polyarchy of City-States in Asia Minor and the islands, is not and cannot be restored with all its former separative autonomy. There must be a combination, else each community will again fall a prey to the power of Persia. Hence comes to the front the Confederacy of City-States with a common power, military and naval, with a common tax, with subordination to the head which is Athens. The bitter experience of Persian domination has decidedly modified, at least for a time, that old one-sided autonomy of the Greek City-State, which has now confederated. But will it hold out when the pressing danger has passed? Will that ingrained Greek political consciousness reassert itself in all its exclusiveness when it finds itself bound to an outside power even with its consent at the start? For ten years of the Confederacy, which was named after the island of Delos where the synod of its members first met, the work of enfranchisement went bravely on, though doubtless with some recalcitration. But when the large island of Naxos revolted in 466, a new current had set in against Athenian domination, which was strengthened the next year by the revolt of Thasos. Manifestly a time of secession from the

Confederacy had begun basing itself always upon autonomy, even if other motives and interests played in.

Moreover the character of Athens has been changing, and with it that of the Confederacy. By the increase of power she has been growing more imperial, passing from leadership to dictatorship, from Hegemony to Heteronomy, and thus has begun to violate deeply the Greek instinct of Autonomy, to secure which her power was first granted. Thus rebellion and secession begin to rise up, but are vigorously suppressed by the central City-State. Then the synod of Delos vanishes and Athens becomes the capital, assuming all the powers of the old Confederacy, and especially controlling its revenues, which are increased in a number of ways.

The character of the war with Persia also changes. The object of it at first was the liberation of the Asiatic Greeks and islanders, which work seems to have been accomplished. What then? The success of Athens over the Persians begins to create in her spirit the design of conquering Persia. The battle of Eurymedon in Pamphylia is the first decided appearance of this ambition (466 B. C), in which battle the Persians are consummately defeated on sea and land. The next strong indication is the support which Athens gives to the Egyptian revolt from Persia (460–465). The later operations in Cyprus look

in the same direction, being conducted by Cimon who is the strongest supporter of this policy of Oriental conquest. But he dies, and the Athenean navy meets with a great disaster in Egypt, so that Athens gives up the dream of conquering Persia, which is left for Alexander. Still further, the defeat of Tolmides at Coroneia in Boeotia (447) causes Athens to abandon the design of becoming a great land-power in continental Greece for the purpose of countervailing Sparta and the Peloponnesians. Some such design she had evidently cherished since her decided victory at Oenophyta in Boeotia nine years before, which marks the greatest extent of her empire (456 B. C).

These reverses all point to one lesson: the Athenian City-State has reached its limit of external conquest, and it has the good fortune to possess at this time a statesman who can read the lesson and enforce the same upon the people by eloquence. Pericles now reaches his supreme political influence, having already opposed the rash enterprise of Tolmides as well as the Cimonian policy of Oriental conquest. Clear is it that he reads the World-Spirit aright. Athens is not organized to be a world-conqueror, backed by her uncertain Confederacy always ready to fly to pieces, and flanked on land by hostile Sparta superior in numbers and in military discipline, and also by hostile Thebes. Nor has the period

come for the rise of the associative City-State like Rome. At the same time Pericles sees that Athens has on her hands a fight for life with her many surrounding foes headed by the Peloponnesians. Let her lay up money in her treasury, increase her navy, keep a firm grip upon the allies — and then unfold her inner spiritual life in its widest sense. Thus arises the famous Periclean age, still unique of its kind.

The chief manifestation of this change was the cessation of the war with Persia, which had lasted so long. The peace of Callias with king Artaxerxes marks the transition (450-449). This peace makes the Aegæan a Greek or rather an Athenian sea, into which no Persian warship is to enter. From the Bosporus to the Chelidonian islands the Oriental navy disappeared. Within the same limits the Greek cities of the coast of Asia Minor were acknowledged by Persia to be autonomous. With such a treaty granted by its enemies, autonomous Hellas was triumphant in the face of the world, and Athens had fulfilled this part of her great mission. On the other hand by the same treaty she renounced all further attempts upon Cyprus, Egypt, in fine upon the Asiatic empire of Persia. The peace of Callias draws the line between Orient and Hellas very decisively, with the injunction that each is to stay in its own territory. (It should be stated that the existence of the peace

of Callias has been often denied, chiefly on account of the fact that it is not mentioned by Thucydides in his brief summary of the events between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars. But the reality of it, yea the necessity of it, has been strongly vindicated by Mr. Grote in his *History of Greece* Vol. V. pp. 335-43, Am ed. It should be added, however, that Mr. Grote does not adequately state the period-making importance of the peace of Callias.)

Thus the struggle between the Orient and the autonomous City-State of Hellas has ended in peace and in complete acknowleged separation. It has lasted a century and more if we reckon from the first historic notice of it by the Father of History. If we reckon from the Trojan War, which really was grounded upon the same conflict, though the transmitted form be mythical and not historical, it has lasted much longer. To be sure the world-historical collision between Orient and Europe does not stop with the peace of Callias, it goes on through history, is going on today. But with the peace of Callias, both sides recognize the cleavage between two continents and their respective principles. The Oriental consciousness, hitherto unlimited and fighting all limitation within itself, has found and acknowleged its limit, doubtless very unwillingly. The Orient is now consciously a stage,

the first stage in the movement of the World's History.

Nor must we forget the process in this triumph of autonomous Hellas. The East-colonial City-States of the three Greek tribes, Ionic, Aeolic and Doric, are subjected by Persia, which then turns to conquor the original City-State of European Hellas. It is the latter which first triumphs and which then goes back to Asia and frees its own enslaved children, the colonies. Such is the historic round of this century of autonomy, passing from its principle overcome in Asia, vindicated in Europe, and then restored in Asia—the latter task being specially that of Athens. In fact Athens was the hero in this whole war for autonomy against the Orient. Strictly she was not the leader, had not the Hegemony—that belonged to Sparta. But she was the Achilles gifted with heroship, not the Agamemnon endowed with leadership, which belonged to Sparta. Thus the old Homeric distinction between Hero and Leader held good in this historic Persian War, as well as in the old legendary Trojan War. Also the twain will quarrel and separate (see First Book of the Iliad). Finally it is the Hero who turns back upon Troy and slays its defender Hector — whereat results a kind of peace with which the Iliad concludes (as the Persian War concludes with the piece of Callias).

Before this time Athens had gradually been

becoming imperial in character and in government. The commutation of military service for money, which many of the allies had requested, brought great sums from them into the treasury, and at the same time weakened their power of resistance. The law-courts of the Confederacy were at the Athenian capital. The meeting of the synod was transferred to Athens, which became the centralized City-State for a thousand vassal City-States — this number, doubtless much exaggerated, is given in a line of Aristophanes. In other words the Hegemony of Athens, intended to secure Autonomy, had turned to a vast organization of Heteronomy, quite contradictory of the Greek political consciousness, of which Sparta began to pose as the special upholder. Thus the dualism was dividing all Greece.

The claim of Athens, and for a long time the just claim, was that she protected the confederated cities from the power of Persia and guarded the commerce of the Aegæan with her navy. But the peace of Callias, which kept Persian warships at a distance, rendered the claim less valid. The allies, relieved of fear, began to sigh for a complete autonomy, their ideal, and naturally some parties would meditate revolt from the Athenian supremacy. The very success of Athens caused the sentiment of her Greek confederates to change from love to hate, because her power collided with their little self-

sufficient community and kept it from having an intramural world all to itself. Moreover the peace of Callias roused new jealousy and anxiety in Sparta and Corinth and the Peloponnesians generally, since Athens was thereby freed of its Oriental task, and could wholly turn back upon Greece. As long as she was engaged in fighting the common enemy of Hellas, she might be tolerated; but that condition of things had ended.

Thus the internal rift in the Greek world has become cankerous. Also the Athenian confederacy shows signs of dissolution. In general Hellas has entered upon a decidedly separative, inwardly negative stage, which now is to break forth in all its virulence, since the outward pressure from the East is removed. The Polyarchy of Hellenic City-States, having triumphed over its external foe, is whelmed back upon its inner enemy, namely itself, colliding with its own inherent limitations. This is the next important process which unfolds itself in the course of Greek History.

The present period of triumph, however, we cannot leave without noticing its two greatest men — Themistocles the Athenian, who won the battle of Salamis, and Pausanias the Spartan, who commanded at Platæa. Each of them having done the grand Pan-Hellenic deed of the age, the defeat of Persia, goes back to his little City-State and falls out with it, when peace has come.

Each of them at the last of life strives to undo his own heroic action, and to bring his country under the domination of the Orient. Tragic characters we have to consider them, in their fate pre-figuring the tragedy of their country, which has the same inner collision as its Great Men. They, having made Hellas autonomous, wind up their existence by trying to unmake her autonomy, and to subject her to that Persian sway which she had thrown off largely through their genius and valor. The Great Man of the Hellenic City-State has in him a tragic strain begotten of his institution which now we are to see as a colossal historic tragedy (read in Thucydides Book I cc. 128–138, the account of the last acts of Pausanias and Themistocles—a deep-toned, pathetic, yet self-suppressing narrative, in which one may feel through the stately style the palpitating heart of the historian, as he foreshadows in the fate of these two heroic figures the coming destiny autonomous Hellas, which is his theme).

II. *Autonomous Hellas in conflict with itself.*— We have just set forth the first stage of Autonomous Hellas — its struggle with the Orient and its triumph. Asia is now spiritually as well as territorially separated from Europe and will remain so. But another more ominous separation has begun, the inner cleavage of Hellas represented by Athens and Sparta. This dualism ex-

tending through the whole Polyarchy of Greek City-States, is now to work itself out historically in a great variety of events. About one hundred years the present period lasts, being reckoned from the peace of Callias (450–49) till the appearance of Philip of Macedon as the chief factor in Greek politics. For it is Philip who begins to put an end to autonomous Hellas in its three phases: in the subordinate City-State, in the leading City-State, and in the total Polyarchy of City States. Henarchy, already springing up inside the Hellenic aggregate and struggling in vain to make itself valid there, enters with Philip from the outside and subordinates Autonomy, which thus ends in the triumph of its opposite, Heteronomy.

The chief arena of History during the period before us is civilized European Greece. Barbarous European Greece begins indeed to come in, the line of backward Greek peoples to the North and West are drawn partially into the maelstrom of central Hellas. Finally Macedon, representing more than anything else the original Ethnic Protoplasm of the Hellenic stock, overflows and baptises civilized autonomous Hellas. On the other hand the colonial City-States of Asia Minor and the islands play a subordinate part, being chiefly concerned with Athens. The colonies to the North in the Thracian territory become important objects of struggle. The West-colonial

world of Hellas in Sicily and Italy has its own separate life, though the Athenian expedition against Syracuse endeavors to connect it with the central mother-country. In general, that which was designated as the Colonial Rim of Hellas is less active and less significant than it was in the early time, History having decidedly moved from the circumference to the center of Hellenic stock.

We wish at once to grasp the period before us in its central movement. This involves the three leading City-States already mentioned — Athens, Sparta, Thebes. First of all comes the fact that each is already the capitol of its own local confederacy — Athens of Attica and its allies, Sparta of Peloponnesus, Thebes of Boeotia. Thus each exercises from the start an Hegemony, and subordinates, if necessary by violence, other autonomous City-States, which are members, or are claimed to be members of its Confederacy. Now the grand ambition of each of these leading City-States is to rise from being the head of its Confederacy to the headship of total Hellas. And during the present century, each will attain the coveted prize for a time; that is, Athens, Sparta, and Thebes will each have its Hegemony in succession. It is evident that the positive element in such an ambition is to bring forth a united Hellenic Nation. In all this weltering, recalcitrant Polyarchy we

find in each leading City-State a decided impulse toward Henarchy, which means in the present case the Greek nationality organized and active as the great ideal end. But such an end remains and must remain ideal in the Hellenic soul, which would otherwise have to give up its autonomy, its walled-up world in the community, its dissociative communal character.

The result is, that the leading City-State which has the Hegemony is pounced upon by the other two leading City-States which have it not, but really want it and work for it. Of course the pretext is always autonomy, the freedom of each community to make its own laws independent of the rest of the world. So it comes that Athens, Sparta, and Thebes will each get the Greek headship, and then each will be pulled down in turn by a combination of the other two, being handicapped of course by its own inner self-contradiction, which says and even thinks Autonomy, but acts Hegemony, and often Heteronomy. Such is the Greek Polyarchy of City-States in its mutual threshing and rending of itself for a century, till each member succeeds in laying the other out helpless, when naturally the outsider steps in and gathers up the prey.

Civilized autonomous Hellas at its heart is, then, fighting itself, and will keep up the fight for this period, when the outcome must be that

it will be both victorious and vanquished in one. It certainly will succeed in putting down itself, its own principle — for that is also its triumph now. More than ever we can compare central Greece to a violently agitated whirlpool in a ceaseless round of struggle with itself, with its own atoms. We recollect the second period of Early Hellas in which occurred those swirling migrations and tribal displacements after the Trojan war. Similar is the maelstrom in this second period of Autonomous Hellas though it is now the City-State, not the Tribe which has the convulsions. And still, strange to say, the Tribe will appear even now in the background. The three leading City-States of the present epoch — Athens, Sparta, Thebes — have each an old tribal substrate, being respectively Ionic, Doric, and Aeolic. Still the autonomous City-State and not the Tribe is at present the all-compelling historic unit, whose process is to be unfolded in this portion of Hellenic History.

It is evident that the politics of this period are exceedingly complicated and become the absorbing human occupation. It is no wonder that the chief philospher of the time, Aristotle, looking upon the activities of the world before him, could declare that man is a political animal. Let us try to follow out some of the tangled threads of the knot. First of all, each subordinate City-State had its own domestic or urban

politics, springing from local parties which favored Monarchos, Aristos, or Demos. Then it had its fluctuating relations to the capital of its Confederacy, in some cases hostile and in some cases friendly. Finally it had to take its attitude towards the City-State which held the headship of all Hellas at the time, and which often favored the subordinate City-State against the confederate leader. For instance, when Thebes had the national headship, Athens would favor the autonomy of Plataea, and Sparta would favor the autonomy of Orchomenus—these two subordinate City-States being properly members of the Boeotian Confederacy whose capitol was Thebes. But Athens and Sparta, wishing to hamstring Thebes, sought to disrupt her Confederacy by favoring the Autonomy of each of its members, though both Athens and Sparta would rigidly suppress Autonomy in their own Confederacies, and resent any interference with the same from the outside.

Distinct from the subordinate City-States, each of the three leaders — Athens, Sparta, Thebes — would have its own politics, urban, interurban, and national. Still different would be the political situation when either of them had the headship of the whole nation (or the Hegemony). Moreover this headship embraced only the civilized portion of Hellas, the Polyarchy of City-States, in contrast with barbarous or semi-

barbarous peoples of the Hellenic stock, some whom began to be drawn into the Greek political maelstrom, till one of them, Macedon, finally got control. And we must not neglect the Persian influence during this period. The Orient still sought to get what it deemed its own — the Greek cities of Asia Minor, which had been wrenched from it by Athens. All three leading City-States — Athens, Sparta, Thebes — will appeal to the Great King of the East for help in their national troubles, and will make important concessions to his power. Thus they really abjure Pan-Hellenic leadership; the great task of Hellas as the defender of European civilization they betray, seeking their own local advantage for the moment. Is it not plain that the Polyarchy of Greek City-States has performed its world-historical function, and has no further right to be?

Hellas, then, cannot be Athenian, Spartan, or Theban, after having tried all three in succession for a hundred years. The Hellenic City-State breaks down in attempting to become the nation. The autonomy which it demands for itself it cannot impart or even permit to other communities, and thus it becomes heteronomous, falling into complete self-negation. What its ancestors fought for and won against the Orient, it seems ready to surrender. Thus we have to say that autonomous Hellas has undone itself, having been

tested and found wanting. It has really begotten that Heteronomy which will appear and take control when it has no longer any control over itself.

The Greek Polyarchy as a whole is to be now conceived as composed of three clusters or groups of City-States, each group having its own capital. Such are the three centers with their appendages, which swirl around and clash against one another in a kind of historic vortex, till they wear themselves out and are seized by the external hand of power. Each of the three seeks to transmute the Greek Polyarchy into the Greek Henarchy, to bring forth a new political form by subordinating the many conflicting City-States into the one supreme City-State, which might be the Nation. But in each case there was failure. Instead of elevating the City-State into the Nation they pulled the Nation down into the City-State and into this particular City-State — Athens, Sparta, Thebes. It was Autonomy for me, and Heteronomy for you, and moreover my Heteronomy for you. Thus the City-State, the peculiar political institution of Hellas, showed itself wholly unable to nationalize Hellas.

We have already seen the Polyarchy of Greek City-States vindicating itself against the collected power of the Orient both in continental Hellas and in Sicily. Europe is thereby definitely born, being severed from Asia (whence it

came) in the throes of a Titanic war. The first great act of European History it is, though many lesser historic acts preceded it and heralded its coming. Such was autonomous Hellas in its triumph; but now we are to behold autonomy conflicting with itself, and in such conflict destroying itself.

Greece has turned back upon itself for an inner development, and this is the next epoch of its career. The group of Hellenic communities, hitherto mostly united in the presence of the over-towering Oriental danger, begins to divide within itself when the external pressure is removed. It goes through a pecular evolution, which is to reveal and to bring out the complete inner character of it until its end. As already indicated, the Hellenic Polyarchy of City-States has in its very nature a separative centrifugal tendency, which is to work itself out till it fling itself to pieces *from within*, when an external Power will appear and hold it together *from without*.

The first act in this process of division after the defeat of the Persian is the formation of the Athenian Empire against the Spartan Hegemony of the Peloponnesian States. Thus the Hellenic world, or the central part of it becomes dualized under two leading City-States. Athens obtains her power chiefly through her navy, and thus is a sea-power; Sparta remains a land-power, such

as she has been for generations. The mobile easy-changing sea seems to impart its character to versatile, shifty Athens; the stable land, in spite of the ever-present tempting waters of the Aegean, fixes and crystallizes the Spartan mind in its transmitted routine and institutions. Still further, between these two City-States is the tribal difference between the Ionian and Dorian, which reaches far back into the original ethnic protoplasm of the Hellenic stock.

Out of this natural difference evolved a great spiritual difference. The flowering of Art, Literature and Philosophy became largely Athenian and Ionic; Sparta and the Dorian lagged in the great movement of civilization, ossified in their transmitted social and political order. Thus it comes that the World-Spirit, working out the Greek problem to its consequences, takes Athens as its chief representative, till its purpose be fulfilled, and it be ready to move elsewhither. In other words, the Athenian character furnishes the best plastic material for that wonderful sculptor called Civilization, and leaves the highest expression of the Greek historic world to the future. Hence the inner conflict of our second leading epoch of Greek History turns upon the tribal dualism between Ionian and Dorian, whose bearers are Athens and Sparta.

Both are essentially autonomous City-States of the Greek pattern, but from this center each

shows a distinct, yea opposite tendency. The Spartan City-State puts its stress upon the side of separate autonomy, though in doing so it asserts its authority, or its supremacy over autonomy. This contradiction we shall find running through its whole career. It can give no ordered freedom among these self-repellent units with their mutual jealousies and hostilities; we shall see that when Sparta conquers, it becomes about the harshest and most corrupt tyrant that Greece ever produced, and she brought forth some pretty bad ones. Athens in her imperial period sought in the main to organize the many disunited communities under a Power which would protect them from without, specially against the Orient, and would leave their internal affairs pretty much to themselves. This task she performed fairly well, though growing more arbitrary, from the end of the Persian till the Peloponessian War — a stretch of forty-five years and over.

But the dissident elements were at work both in the central city and in the members. Athens would interfere in the affairs of the allied City-States, setting up democracy and pulling down aristocracy. Thus she got mixed up in the party conflicts of each ally, and made political enemies. She, being a democracy, sought to transform every member after her own self as the pattern, often changing its constitution in what she

deemed her own interest. Thus she assailed inner autonomy, and caused permanent division and hatred of her rule. She might have insisted upon the political parties of a member keeping the peace, but she sided with one of them and thus became a partisan herself—asserted Heteronomy and not merely Hegemony.

Moreover her imperial control for the purpose of saving the entire lot, caused protest in these City-States, each of which deemed itself to be independent of the whole world. The hostile party, usually the aristocratic, deprived of its share in government, took advantage of this violation of Greek political consciousness on the part of Athens, and sought the overthrow not merely of the opposite party, but of Athenian supremacy, which was so closely interlinked with it.

It is evident that Athens stands for the inner unity of the Greek People, their organization into a large and powerful State, which could meet its foes on all sides of the horizon and assert its independence. We have to think that in the mind of Pericles floated dimly the far-off ideal of the Nation-State, really the present outcome of Europe's History. But Athens could not accomplish it, she was too Greek, too much of the City-State herself. On the other hand Civilization was not yet ready for such a political birth, but has to evolve through numerous in-

termediate forms, which are to rise hereafter. The World-Spirit also marches by step by step, and it was not attuned to stride at once into our modern world. It must yet unfold a good deal, for it too is subject to evolution.

And now can we foreshadow something like the historic process of these three City-States in their century of self-undoing? Athens at first occupies the attention during this period of Hellenic History, and has a maritime headship which embraces nearly all the islands and sea-cities of the Aegean. Sparta, however, continues to hold the Peloponnesian headship at the same time. But Athens falls and Sparta gets the total headship, which becomes a system of many tyrannies. This is at last overthrown by Thebes under Epaminondas. Thus the third national headship arises but rapidly goes to pieces, leaving Hellas a much divided, helpless chaos of colliding City-States. The Polyarchy of autonomous members passes soon into Henarchy, between two forms of which, the Persian and Macedonian, its historic development has lain.

Autonomous Hellas is usually called free Hellas, and when it goes down, many a plaintive regret is heard from old Greek writers and well as from modern historians, lamenting the extinction of Grecian liberty by the barbarous tyrant of Macedon. But we are to see the autonomous City-State of Hellas as self-destroy-

ing, and at best as a very limited manifestation of political freedom. It has its place in the grand historic evolution of the ages, but so has Macedon. The World-Spirit, unfolding thorough particular forms the State universal, evoked them both as stages of its process. But now we shall look separately at three City-States, of which we have collectively spoken.

(*a*) Athens as autonomous City-State is self-undoing from within, and then is undone from without. The grand act of her Hegemony was to preserve the Autonomy of her Greek allies against the Persian empire, but in this very act she herself turned imperial. This tendency, previously growing, became pronounced about the time of the peace of Callias. The policy of Pericles was to unite maritime Hellas in an Athenian Empire, holding aloof from possessions in Continental Hellas and in the Greek colonies of the West. If Athens would keep her ambition within these limits, Pericles thought that she would defeat Sparta and the Peloponnesians. Time confirmed his view. It was his greatness to recognize the bounds of the Athenian City-State, what it could and what it could not do. After his death Athens began to lose sight of his policy, and entered finallly upon the Sicilian expedition, in which she overdid and so undid herself.

The war usually called the Peloponnesian

opens and lasts twenty-seven years (431–404 B. C.). It is at bottom a struggle between the tendency toward national unity under a City-State and the tendency toward autonomous separation of the many City-States. The underlying problem runs thus: Can the Greeks become a Nation politically? Have they the ability to form one great Hellenic State out of their dissident fragments? It is the world-historical interest of Athens that she made the attempt at Greek nationality. She took many successful steps toward the Greek Henarchy which lay ideally in her soul, as we can observe in her literature and her philosophy; but at last she failed. Her institutional form, the City-State, contradicted itself and went to pieces in trying to stretch itself into an Empire. She was captured by her Spartan foe, and had her own political act served up to herself with bitter intensity: she, the City-State subjecting City-States, is herself subjected to a City-State.

This negative process of Athenian History is the theme of a great piece of historic writing by Thucydides, who was a citizen of Athens. His work is on many sides the counterpart and the fulfilment of Herodotus. Still he does not cover the whole period, as his History stops quite suddenly before the close of the Peloponnesian War, and thus is incomplete. The struggle between Athens and Sparta, which had become

pronounced after the peace of Callias, had lasted some forty-five years, when Athens fell, having shown a greater amount of political activity and of lofty intellectual production than any city before or since. In the modern sense Athens was a small place, but look at her works. She lived fast while she lived, and her life politically was a brilliant process of undoing herself.

The pivotal act of Athenian self-undoing was the expedition against Sicily (415 B. C.). She had been substantially victorious over Sparta in the long strife of sixteen years from the begining of the war, which was about ready to stop altogether. But now Athens violated the Periclean limitation which she had before recognized and respected. She was tempted to move beyond her own Aegean and to undertake the conquest of the West-colonial City-States of Sicily, beginning with Syracuse. In the first place the locality lay beyond her possible territoral bounds. In the next place she meant downright subjugation of the Hellenic City-State, not alliance, not protection against a foreign foe, which was the ground of her East-colonial sway. In the third place she could appeal to no such extensive tribal affinity in the West as in the East, where the Greeks were largely of Ionic blood and her own colonies orignally. She denied her own history and belied her own principle; she became Persian and sought to do in Sicily what Xerxes had sought to do in

Hellas. The logic of her own greatest deeds of Marathon and Salamis turned against her overwhelmingly; as she crushed the Persians, so she was crushed by the Syracusans and their allies, and for the same reason. Thus she was self-undoing, the spirit of Athens was to destroy Athens, and of course she succeeded.

The Sicilian catastrophe left her no adequate power to defend herself at home on her own waters. As she has wiped out by her conduct the very reason of her original supremacy in the Aegean, that supremacy ceases after a slow dying of eight years more, culminating in the capture of the city by Lysander, the Spartan.

(*b*) Sparta as autonomous City-State is also self-undoing from within and is undone from without. Having conquered the Athenian empire in the oft-proclaimed interest of Autonomy, she at once turns imperial herself, yea tyrannical. But hers was not simply one tyranny — a thing which might be said of Athens. She set up in each City-State her tyrant called the Harmost, who ruled without law. The result was that Sparta brought forth a Polyarchy of Tyrannies, each Spartan at once seemed to turn tyrant. This is the grand transformation wrought in Hellas by the Hegemony of Sparta: Autonomy turns into a manifold Heteronomy of the tyrannical sort. The multiplicity of tyrants was shown in Athens especially, which had its reign of

thirty tyrants following the capture. Thus Sparta showed her inherent political character: every Spartan man is trained to be a tyrant, not a ruler. For not one Spartan in this time of supremacy showed any gift of statesmanship; he could only apply the harsh and narrow routine of Lycurgean discipline to all Hellas, by which universal application that discipline broke down completely. Soon the Spartan Hegemony was far more detested than the Athenian had ever been.

Behold too the new shifting of the three leading City-States. In a few years Thebes, which in the Peleponnesian war had aided Sparta to conquer Athens, and was always ready to strike her in the flank, falls out with Sparta and asks the help of the Athenians, who grant it unanimously. Lysander, parent of Spartan tyranny is slain, and the new war is transferred, with the help of Corinth and Argos into the Peloponnesus, the home of Sparta, which she succeeds in holding after a severe battle. But she loses her maritime supremacy through the Athenian victory at Knidus, won by Conon, who now rebuilds the Long Walls of Athens and thus gives to the latter a new independence. The head cities of the two confederacies, Thebes and Athens, are now striving to pull down Sparta which has the national headship; they have the assent of all Hellas which

is more unanimous now against Sparta than formerly against Athens.

At this turn of her affairs Sparta invoked the aid and the authority of Persia to sustain her declining power. The peace of Antalcidas (387 B. C.) recognized the command of the Persian King that all the cities of Hellas should be autonomous. Sparta was to enforce its provision; under this pretext she broke up the Boeotian Confederacy, divided Mantinea into its constituent villages, suppressed the Olynthian league, and in general sought to pulverize all Greece in the name of Autonomy. Of course she kept her own power everywhere, seizing the Theban citadel and even trying to seize the Acropolis of Athens. In a sense the peace of Antalcidas was the grand historic comedy of Greece, in which the immemorial Persian enemy of Autonomy was introduced as commanding it, and Sparta, masked as its friend, was doing all that she could to destroy it. Autonomy was verily turned inside out, self contradictory, self-annulling, absurd, comic. This was the work of the Spartan actor.

But now comes the reverse. Thebes recovers her citadel and with it her freedom; she begins to reestablish her Boeotian Confederacy, and above all she produces a great man, altogether the greatest man of his time—Epaminondas. He organizes Thebes, he forms its Sacred Band of warriors to meet the Spartan soldiers, and gets

ready to smite the Spartan Hegemony a deadly blow. The opportunity occurs at Leuctra (371 B. C.) in which battle Sparta is defeated and at once loses her Hegemony, the Harmosts and their garrisons being expelled from nearly every City-State of Hellas.

Thus Sparta fell as Athens fell, after a supremacy of some thirty-two years. The best thing to be said of her is that she sought to unite Hellas, but her failure was ridiculous, in every way worse than that of Athens. And now the third leading City-State has risen to the supreme power, and we are to see what she will be able to do with it.

(*c*). Thebes as autonomous City-State is also self-contradictory and hence self-undoing, for within her territory, or that of the Boeotian Confederacy, she allows no autonomy. Her dealings with Plataea form a harsh episode in Greek History. Herein, however, she is quite like Athens and Sparta: as the head of her allied communities she crushes in them the right which she insists upon possessing exclusively herself. At the same time she is ready to vindicate the autonomy of the members of other leagues against their leading cities.

Thebes recovers the headship of Boeotia, and also by the battle of Leuctra she gains the headship of Greece, taking it away from Sparta. Athens has aided her, but now gets jealous of

her in the moment of her supremacy, and begins to look toward a Spartan alliance. Such has been the policy of all three: the two which are out combine against the one which is in. So the three chief City-States have nullified each other's unification of Greeee, for Thebes is bound to go the same way that Athens and Sparta have gone. When she is done, the round is completed, all three being exhausted and self-undone.

Epaminondas after Leuctra enters the Peloponnesus, which he proposes to reconstruct in opposition to the Spartan policy. This has sought, especially under the recent headship, to dissolve the City-State into its constituent villages, as in the case of Mantinea, or to prevent the villages from coalescing into a City-State which might have power and autonomy. Thus Sparta has kept the Peloponnesus in a backward, Proto-Hellenic condition, as far as she could; particularly is this the case with Arcadia. Epaminondas causes Mantinea to be restored, establishes Messene, and builds a new city in Arcadia called Megalopolis. These three new cities surround Sparta on her border, watching her with a jealous and unremitting vigilance. The Peloponnesus is thereby unchained, and will again have a little History as it had in Homer's time. This work of Epaminondas must be deemed a great enfranchisement. Of course he destroys Spartan Hegemony not only abroad but

at home, and confines its hundreds of tyrants to its own territory, which is also much reduced by him from its previous extent.

The Thebans proceed to invoke against the Spartans a religious element, getting them condemned by the Amphictyonic assembly for their seizure of the Cadmeia. This introduces into Greek politics a new element of which Philip hereafter will obtain the chief benefit. The tables are indeed turned: the Delphic Oracle had been the tool of the Spartans; now it is directed against them. Also the Thebans appeal to Persia and get a rescript (a new peace of Antalcidas) authorizing their Hegemony and the Autonomy of Messene: verily a Spartan measure turned against Sparta. Thus all three of the great City-States of Greece — Athens, Sparta, and Thebes — appeal to an outside power for support. Moreover the autonomous City-States established by Thebes in the Peloponnesus, become discordant with Theban Hegemony. Epaminondas has to go again into the Peloponnesus with an army, where he wins the battle of Mantinea (362 B. C.), but is mortally wounded. His last words are: "You must make peace with the enemy," indicating his opinion that Thebes could not now carry on the war. He was right: in his personality the headship of Thebes centered.

The religious ghost which Thebes had evoked

for her own advantage against the Spartans, was now conjured up to her ruin by her enemies, the Phocians, giving rise to the ten years' Sacred War, which ended with the introduction of Macedonian Philip into Greece. In fact Thebes became nothing after the death of Epaminondas, it was unable to exercise the headship which it had won. Hence the Polyarchy of Greek City-States had really no Hegemony — a condition in which they had not been since the dawn of their History, for the first Spartan Hegemony existed already in the time of Croesus. Such was the complete disintegration and dissolution of the Greek Polyarchy into its constituent atoms, after the time of Epaminondas, who was the last Great Man produced by the City State. To be sure the Achaean League will bring forth some strong characters, but it is no longer the present form of the Hellenic City-State.

It is the chief merit of Thebes that she produced such a man as Epaminondas, who made the new synthesis, both military and civil, which transcended the Spartan supremacy. But if he disorganized the Hegemony of Sparta, he could not organize permanently the Hegemony of Thebes, which had no navy and no gift for national leadership. It is to be observed that Sparta produced during this time no Great Man, the Spartans seemed all alike, equally capable and equally incapable. That discipline of theirs

showed its deepest nature by reducing all individuality to the same dead level; Athens in this respect, as in most others, was the opposite.

Thus the self-conflicting and self-undoing autonomous Polyarchy of Hellas has gone its round through its three Hegemonies—Athenian, Spartan, Theban—for a hundred years, and has ended in the destruction of all Hegemony, which never failed in its success to be the assailant of Autonomy. A process of three Tyrannies they may be regarded; Athens became one tyrant, Sparta became many tyrants, Thebes was again one tyrant over Boeotia and partially over the Peloponnesus, where she completely undid the many tyrannies of Spartan supremacy. But she having done this task, went to pieces herself on the death of her Great Man.

For sixteen years after the battle of Mantinea, the Greek Polyarchy was drifting in chaos. Each of the chief City-States had nullified the authority of the others and of itself over the Hellenic entirety. Athens having recovered her maritime empire loses it again at once through what is known as the Social War, which is a revolt of her leading allies. Sparta, confined to her own little territory, is watching her opportunity to break through the cordon of City-States established on each side of her by Epaminondas. Thebes is hamstrung at home by the Sacred War, in which the Phocians seize Delphi and use its

treasures against their Theban foes with success — her own scheme being turned against her. So the Polyarchy of autonomous City-States, lies around Greece in scattered atoms, each of which is in a struggle within and without.

A desperate time it was certainly, in which the old institutional order based on the City-State, was dying, which to the Greek soul of that age meant the grand cataclysm of the universe. But the sixteen years pass away, when Philip of Macedon comes to the front in the Greek civilized world; he is invoked by Thebes to put an end to the Sacred War, which he does; he is made a member of the Amphictyonic league, being really its leader; he is greeted as the defender and deliverer of the Delphic Oracle, as the upholder of the Greek religion; he is chosen to preside at the great Pan-Hellenic festival, the Pythian games. Chiefly, however, he has seized the pass of Thermopylæ, and can now get into Greece when he chooses. Here is the man of destiny rising in the Greek horizon and bringing the new order.

III. *Autonomous Hellas Subordinate.* The master whom civilized Hellas sought within itself for a century or more, now appears as an outsider, Philip King of Macedon. The vortex of City-States in its whirl between Athens, Sparta, Thebes, must be stopped by an external power, being unable to stop itself after many

trials. The Henarchy which the Polyarchy has not been competent to evolve and to conjoin harmoniously with itself, is brought to it from the outside by Monarchos who forcibly subordinates Demos and Aristos to himself. Heteronomy is triumphant over Autonomy formerly triumphant, which has undone itself and evokes its opposite.

Civilized Greece is to experience the rule of semi-barbarous Macedon, since it cannot rule itself. Since it cannot make itself a nation, it is handed over to a nation, which is to start its nationalization. It is unified, even if from the outside. But we are not to think that the Macedonians are of alien race, or even of alien stock. They are Proto-Hellenic, a backward people of Hellenic blood, rude indeed, but unspoiled by the negative element of Greek civilization. Into this primitive original protoplasm of itself the civilized Greek world is to be plunged, really for its salvation, and not for its destruction. The World-Spirit has decreed that Hellas is not to die, though she has tried hard to commit suicide. As City-State indeed she has undone herself forever. But Greek Spirit is to survive, and does survive through this Macedonian baptism of it into its creative source.

And now we are to look at the particular means and at the historic events in which this great transition clothes itself. First of all comes the the pivotal man, King Philip, who is the bridge

crossing over from autonomous to heteronomous Hellas. The basic fact of his career is that he, the royal heir of Macedon, went to Thebes as a hostage at the age of fifteen and stayed probably three years, during the Theban Hegemony which lasted substantially from 371 till 362. What an education for his future! He had intercourse with Epaminondas and Pelopidas, and doubtless took the Theban military training, the best of the time. He also studied rhetoric and became a good speaker in Greek according to the orator Aeschines, certainly a competent judge. He must have imbibed somewhat of philosophy and of Greek culture generally. But his practical training far surpassed his theoretical, and must have appealed more strongly to his native tastes. Epaminondas had already surpassed the old tactics of Sparta, especially by the formation of his wedge-shaped column and by its great depth. To Philip the problem must have come sooner or later: how shall I transcend the Theban military device which won at Leuctra? He showed at Chaeroneia that he had done so, chiefly by means of the *sarissa* or long pike, which he may have seen in his wars with the Thracian barbarians, or have read of in Xenophon, who speaks of it as the weapon of an Asiatic tribe. But most instructive must have been the example of Epaminondas, probably the greatest commander

of land-forces tnat the Greek City-State ever produced.

Philip at Thebes could also have learned the chief lesson of Greek politics. He must have been aware of the decadence of the City-State, for it was proclaimed on all sides by word and deed. The ambition for headship he could not help feeling at Thebes which possessed it at that time. And he could not fail to note that Theban supremacy hung on the life of one man — Epaminondas, soon to be slain on the field of Mantinea. After him — what? Of course he thought of himself as possible successor, since the other leading City-States, Athens and Sparta, had already undone themselves. An insight into the working of political parties of the City-State he obtained at Thebes, as well as into the corruptibility of Greek politicians generally. Philip's money was afterwards one of his chief weapons. At the capital of Hellas he got to know the Greek character as well as the condition of the Greek Polyarchy of City-States. He also felt the pulse of that deepest Hellenic aspiration, the conquest of the Orient, upon which they might be united in a new Persian war.

Such was the Greek apprenticeship of Philip for his coming task, unpurposed, unconscious on both sides, truly imposed of the World-Spirit. Then he goes home and begins to organize his Macedonians, chiefly poor rude shepherds clothed

in skins (as Alexander once told them reproachfully in Asia). They lived still in primitive Village Communities, they had evolved no City-State, their capitol Pella had probably no conception of autonomy. Philip's ambition is not to build a City-State but a Nation; he has seen the Hellenic City-State in its dissolution and heard its aspiration for nationality, though totally impotent to attain it. And this will give the key to his whole career, at least to the positive side of it: Philip proposes to make the entire Hellenic stock a nation. The civilized City-State could not do it, nor could the uncivilized tribal Village Community do it. Both the advanced and the backward elements of total Hellas, hitherto mutually repellent, he would co-alesce, and out of the union make a new Hellenic nation with its one State. That deep scission between barbarous and civilized Greece must be overcome if there is ever to be a Greek people again. Philip has been tremendously abused by the Athenian orators, especially by the greatest one of them all, Demosthenes, and maledictions have been heaped upon him by historians of Greece all along the line down to George Grote (also a great man in his way). Undoubtedly Philip did seek to get rid of the old Hellenic City-State, moribund at that time, and self-undone; practically he would inoculate it with a new principle and thereby perpetuate its intellectual and even civic

life, but no longer could it be autonomous. Now we cannot help seeing that the World-Spirit, presiding over and evolving all History, was on the side of Philip, yea took him as its supporter and incarnate protagonist, giving him victory and making his work relatively permanent, for that Macedonian State, founded and organized by Philip, lasted some hundreds of years, till it passed over into Rome, the next great stage of ancient European History. It is not our purpose to justify the World's-Spirit, for it needs no justification, as it is itself the final tribunal of all Justice; still it is worth while to peer into the depths of its workings and behold the eternal essences of historic events there active. So we must seek to fathom and to express the world-historical mission of Macedonian Philip, for that he had such a mission is manifest from the ineffaceable stamp which he set upon the movement of History.

The grand controlling motive of Philip's whole career comes out distinctly and expressly in the terms which he made with the Greek City-States after the battle of Chæroneia. They must all acknowledge him as having the headship of Hellas — not Athens, not Sparta, not Thebes — all of these have had their day and done their work. Autonomous Hellas is at an end, and must quit housekeeping, having had its centuries of trial, of which all future time will glorify the

historic grandeur and the absorbing human interest. Philip is declared at the Synod of Corinth Pan-Hellenic president and generalissimo, being both a political and a military man. Thus the Polyarchy of Hellenic City-States has gone its last inner round, that maelstrom has ceased its whirl, though it will try to start up again several times hereafter. Its world-historical function is brought to a close in a new order; Polyarchy has gone over into Henarchy, and Autonomy has become Heteronomony, but a new Hellenic Nation has certainly started and will show its superabundant strength.

And now what? Is Philip going simply to enjoy his freshly won power? Not at all. He takes the next step, which shows his purpose to place himself at the head of the new nationality of Hellas in its deepest, most abiding aspiration. This was, as we have seen all through Greek History, to turn back upon the Orient and subject it to Hellenic sway. And so Philip convenes a congress of Greek City-States at the isthmus of Corinth and declares his purpose to make an expedition against Persia for the purpose of liberating the Greeks of Asia Minor and avenging the wrong done to Greece by the Persian kings some hundred and fifty years before. Already the orator Isocrates had suggested this idea of invading Asia to Philip in a discourse dated usually eight years before the battle of Chæroneia.

Indeed we have observed often this national or Pan-Hellenic sentiment (see p. 204) which was first roused against the Orient by the Trojan war, and was kept alive by the poems of Homer, read and cherished by every Greek throughout the world. Then the Greco-Persian war stirred the national Folk-Soul to its depths, while the conflict with Persia had never ceased on the borderland. Now it was this sentiment of a total Hellenic nationality, to which Philip appealed. Was he sincere therein? It is easy enough to blacken his motives, but we are inclined to believe that he felt in his own heart the rising new Hellenic Nationality, not limited to the old City-States, but including total Hellas, its backward as well as its advanced peoples. Hitherto cultured Greece has turned up its nose at its barbarous kindred, though the latter have the unperverted, uncorrupted blood which is to redeem the decayed civilization of the age. Philip really makes a new and higher synthesis of the Hellenic stock for a rejuvenation of its spirit and of its authority. We hold that this task lay in the necessity of his nature and that he in his way heard the command of the the World-Spirit and obeyed, had to obey.

Thus Philip is a return to the collision with Orient, which was also that of autonomous Hellas in its triumph. We have seen how Persia sought to subject Greek nationality, and how it

was resisted and foiled by the union of the Hellenic City-States. But these, having wrought out their historic destiny, have called forth another power different in kind from theirs, but still aspiring to vindicate the Hellenic nation against Oriental rule. Indeed we may see in Philip a deeper return of Hellas to its beginning —in a way he is again King Agamennon bearing sway over many cities and islands, and uniting the Greek people under his leadership against Troy. Verily the mythical soul of Hellas, always active and needing food, might behold in him and his project its grand poetic prototype and typical deed renewed and endowed with an actual present life. So old Isocrates and doubtless many others dreamed. Moreover Philip belonged in fact to a kind of primitive Homeric State like those assembled before Troy under their Kings or Chieftains. Philip really returns and makes civilized Greece return with him to the primordial Hellenic protoplasm of peoples, out of which Homer and his heroes, the historic City-State, in fine Greek civilization sprang, and to which it must go back for a baptismal regeneration.

Philip is, therefore, the Great Man of his time, mediating the Hellenic Folk-Soul with the World-Spirit, and carrying Hellas over into the next world-historical stage. Through his Greek training, political and military, he moulded the primordial tribal protoplasm of Macedonia into a

State and an army, which indeed subordinated the old and decayed City-State of Hellas, but which at the same time reconstructed the Greek political world, and opened to Greek spirit a vast new field of activity. Philip realized the deep Hellenic aspiration for nationality, evidently in the sole possible way at his time. That is, he was the man who mediated the total Hellenic Folk-Soul, which was both civilized and barbarous, with the movement of the World's History, in producing and organizing a new world-historical nation. The City-State, once so prolific of Great Men, had ceased begetting them, while barbarous Hellas became the mother of the most illustrious Pan-Hellenic sons — Philip and Alexander. It is noteworthy that no man of action, even of second rate, appeared in the field against Philip. Athens, Sparta, Thebes cannot show one commanding figure as soldier. Who led the Theban and Athenian contingents at Chæroneia? Well, who did? Nobodies, in the ken of History. But we all know that on the Macedonian side Philip and young Alexander were there in the thick of the fight. Another evidence we must deem it that civilized Hellas, if she is ever again to be productive of greatness, must be turned back to its original fountain, to the protoplasmic peoples of her own stock, for a fresh dip in its creative sources. Indeed whether it

wishes so or not, it must go back thither, for so the World-Spirit has clearly decreed.

It is true that Philip was double, he was in himself both civilized and barbarous. Somewhat Oriental or rather Trojan in his household; he had one chief wife, like Hecuba; yet he, like Priam, had other lesser wives. The fact that he divorced Olympias, in order to marry Eurydice, implies monogamy as first, even if it was not very rigidly maintained. Domestic conflict paid him back terribly, and at a later time completely wiped out his family. Then Philip's drunkenness has become proverbial through all time in the response: "I appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober." At his second wedding he is reported to have fallen down in an attempt to slay his son Alexander. He is charged with lying, with disregard of oaths, with bribery; very black is his moral character as painted by the orator Demosthenes and by the historian Theopompus. It is highly probable that he would use any means to gain his supreme political end. Whatever stood in the way of Macedonizing, or we may say, of nationalizing Hellas, was ruthlessly set aside or trampled under foot. Chiefly the old Greek City-State was the obstruction, in removing which he was certainly immoral and merciless. Barbarous he was assuredly, but he was also civilized and often showed himself in this way. Thus he united double Hellas in one soul, even uniting

it in one State and thus overcoming its deepest dualism. Unless Philip had been just this synthesis of civilized and barbarous Hellas, he never could have performed his world-historic function.

The birth of Philip is assigned to 383, B. C. He was given a Greek education, as the Macedonian kings of that time were Hellenizing or rather Atticizing, even to the extent of philosophizing with Plato. In 359 B. C. he became the ruler of Macedon. He had many wars with the surrounding peoples. But his great object was to subordinate the Greek City-State, both colonial and central. The main steps of this movement lasting till his death in 336 B. C. we shall briefly note.

(*a*) He subjects in part and destroys in part the colonial City-States of the Northern Aegean, especially those which lie on the Macedonian seacoast. We find him already in the second year of his rule beseiging Amphipolis and having a conflict with Olynthus, whose confederacy had been dissolved and ruined by Sparta after the peace of Antalcidas. These Greek City-States of the Chalcidic peninsula are stated to have been thirty-two in number; it was Philip's first policy to get rid of this new Colonial Polyarchy of City-States, which threatened to be a second regenerated Hellas in the North, and thus to take the place of Macedon. In 347 B. C. Olynthus

was seized by him and dismantled, and the first dozen years of Philip's reign end in the complete destruction of this Northern rival to Macedonian supremacy. It was indeed his first great conflict with the Hellenic City-State, and so desperate was his hostility that the very foundations of many of these towns could not be traced a few years later, according to a statement of Demosthenes (in his third Philippic).

(*b*) Philip having thus gotten rid of the danger at home on his flank, turns South toward original Hellas. At the request of Thebes he ends the Sacred War (346 B. C.) and then he is chosen a member of the Amphictyonic Council, which means that he is practically the head of it, and can determine in its name, and in that of the Delphic Oracle, whose liberator he is declared to be, Grecian affairs. The pass of Thermophylae, the gate leading to Greece proper, to the Polyarchy of original City-States, he secures for himself, and can file an army through it when he pleases. He is made in the same fateful year the president of the Pythian games, a Pan-Hellenic festival. A great and lucky year for Philip is this (346 B. C.), really the transition from tribal barbarous Macedon to the civilized City-State, which is rapidly getting its master. Significant is the fact that embassies to Philip from Athens, Sparta, Thebes, not to speak of those from other places, were to be seen

at the same time in Pella, the capitol of Macedon. The three leading City-States of Greece are seeking their center outside of themselves, and will surely find it; in fact, it is coming to them at home. Each tries to win Philip's favor for itself against the others; he sides with Thebes, for thus he can get Thermopylae and Delphi from the Phocians. In this same year (346), Athens is completely outwitted and hamstrung by the peace of Philocrates; her allies, the Phocians, with their twenty-two towns are ruined.

Still the first effect of this ominous entrance of Philip into the Greek world was suspicion and fear. The old Polyarchy, prostrate and effete, but certainly intelligent, could hardly help reading its doom. At once two parties arose everywhere: for and against Philip. Hitherto at Athens these parties had been existent for years, since Philip had assailed Athenian allies in the North, and Demosthenes had thundered at him in the distance. But now all Hellas begins to feel the coming peril. Especially Athens bestirs herself anew, and tries to rouse a Pan-Hellenic sentiment against the barbarous intruder. Demosthenes, mighty in word, makes the tour of the Peloponnesus, exciting the City-States there upon the all-absorbing theme. Previously his audience was confined to Athens, but now it has widened out over all Greece.

After years of mutual friction, a new Sacred War breaks out, this one against the Locrians, and Philip comes into Greece a second time as general of the Amphictyonic Council in defence of the Oracle.

(*c*) The old Polyarchy gets ready to make a last fight for life, since it is evident that Philip under his religious disguise has come this time to stay. Demosthenes again does wonders with that tongue of his; he soon wins Thebes, hitherto devoted to Philip, and hostile to Athens from time immemorial. But the outcome is the crushing defeat at Chæroneia (338 B. C.) through which Autonomous Hellas with its Polyarchy of City-States lies at the feet of victorious Philip, who is soon acknowledged by all of them, except Sparta, as having the headship of Greece. He has attained the first great prize of his ambition, though we shall soon see him reaching out for another—nothing less than the Orient, which however, he is destined not to get. After the battle a synod of the Polyarchy of Hellenic City-States is convened at Corinth by and around Philip, and through their own deed they recognize him as master of themselves, making themselves subordinate to an external authority, and thus surrendering their long-cherished principle of autonomy. Not merely a new Hellenic power but a new Hellenic consciousness has dawned and is making itself valid, having united in a

political form both barbarous and civilized Greece, and overcome, at least externally, the disintegrating Greek dualism. Willing or unwilling, the total Hellenic stock may now be called a Nation for the first time in its history or even in its poetry, since Homer shows no political Hellas organized as a whole, and just as little or even less does Herodotus, though both Poet and Historian portray the grand national conflict with the Orient.

Philip was not old when he perished (in 336 B. C.), being in his forty-seventh year, and having reigned twenty-three years. Still his work was done, which was to organize Proto-Hellenic Macedon for the purpose of uniting under it and with it into one nation barbarous and civilized Hellas. The various stages of this movement we may again repeat: first, after establishing his power at home, he destroys the derived or colonial Greek City-States of the North, which were his competitors on his own ground, and blocked his way to a world-historical career — hence his savage fight with them for more than ten years; second is that pivotal year of his (346 B. C.) which puts into his hands the means for reaching and getting hold of civilized, original Greece (this, we recollect, was what the Persian King, grasped after but was beaten off), yet which rouses the old spirit of autonomy into a new activity, and calls up two parties in each

City-State, one for and one against him; then is the conclusion at Chaeroneia and Corinth, in which original (not derived) Hellas subordinates itself to him (with the one exception). Thus Philip's career completes itself by getting substantial possession of the total peninsula of European Hellas, with its barbarous and civilized peoples, with its derived and original City-States, reaching from the indefinite North (seemingly from the Danube in places) to the southern promontories of the Peloponnesus. All this territory was united for the first time under one goverment, already organized and ready for its Oriental task.

It is plain, then, that Philip has done that which Darius and Xerxes would but could not do: he has gotten and substantially united the total Greek Peninsula, whose peoples are now prepared to turn back East for a visit to their original home. Let it be said again that Philip represented this Peninsula, the whole of it as none other, being both a barbarian and a civilzed man in himself, combined with a genius all his own. Of course he was a drunkard, a libertine, a perjurer, certainly not a good moral man; yet he was was world-historical, and in this light we have here to consider him. Let there be no palliation of his sins; nevertheless the World-Spirit chose him as its instrument, or on the

other hand he chose it as the grand end of his endeavor.

In the period before us Demosthenes may be called the hero of the sinking City-State, the upholder of the outgoing world-order. Truly a theme of eloquence is this: appeals to former glorious deeds, flagellations of the present degeneracy, plaintive moans of dying greatness. Really, however, Demosthenes was speaking against the World-Spirit, cursing its representative with a mighty outpour of verbal damnation which worried and sometimes tormented Philip (see his letter to the Athenians usually printed in the works of Demosthenes). Unconcious gleams of the true situation however we may find even in Demosthenes; note the passage in which he declares to the Athenians: if anything should happen to this Philip, you would soon create another. Truly so; indeed that is just the genesis of Philip—he is the necessary product of the autonomous City-State of Hellas. Still Demosthenes keeps working away at his Sisyphean job of trying to persuade the City-State to slay its own historic child, though it will at once bring forth another like the first one. Intense, bitter, one-sided we must regard him, calling the Greek statesmen who differed from him by the odious name of traitors, and thus leaving to future Greece a legacy of heart-burning in his eloquence. Listen to Polybius writing some two

centuries later, and protesting against the vilification of "the most illustrious Greeks" by the Athenian orator, who "measures everything by the interests of his own particular City-State, and thinks that all the Greeks ought to have their eyes upon Athens on the pain of being called traitors." So Demosthenes was not even Pan-Hellenic, according to Polybius but narrowly Athenian (Hist. XVII. 14). Of course he is not to be blamed because he did not see the world-historical trend of his time. Still he is the most interesting, yea heroic figure on the side of the expiring City-State, which he sought to galvanize into a new life by his words, still to-day electrical to his reader. Pathetically tragic he he is in life and death, like his own institutional world of which he is the best reflection in words and deeds. Philip knew him, and after the submission of Athens let him live in spite of all of his philippics of personal defamation, which act Polybius rightly regards as an act of generosity, though Grote sees in it selfish policy, being also a vindicator of the Hellenic City-State.

Philip as a youth at Thebes knew and admired Epaminondas, a man not only of words but also of deeds, really the one Great Man of action of the later Greek City-State. Still he did not rise out of the old institutional limits, his view was confined to the transmitted City-State and its autonomy — that is, autonomy for the rest of

Greece but not for the Theban Confederacy. Hence what he served up to Sparta, was after him served up to Thebes. Really Philip is the political synthesis beyond Epaminondas and the City-State. Also the military synthesis: which fact was manifest at the battle of Chæroneia when the Theban Sacred Band trained by Epaminondas met the Macedonian Phalanx trained by Philip, who destroyed them to a man.

After the battle of Chæroneia, Philip was certainly moderate in his treatment of Athens, as we see by the terms of the peace of Demades. One imagines that he may have remembered the part which Athenian Plato had in shaping his early career. For it was Plato who advised Philip's brother Perdiccas, then king of Macedon, to give the young fellow an opportunity to test his mettle of leadership, by letting him have a province to govern. This Perdiccas did, and Philip at once tried his hand in organizing and disciplining soldiery. Here without question began the germ of the Macedonian phalanx before which Greece and then Persia fell, whereby the World's History was changed — all of it traceable to a little piece of advice given at the right moment by the philosopher Plato. Shall we then say that Plato was the cause of the overthrow of the autonomous Greek City-State, which he tries to reform and thus save in his *Republic?* The philosopher may have had

a hand in determining the particular place and time of the grand world-historical act; but another place and time, and even another man would have been found by the World-Spirit in case of need. History, however, would array herself in a different garment of events.

Plainly autonomous Hellas has become subordinate, and is accordingly, no longer autonomous, even if at the synod of Corinth, each Hellenic City-State is declared free — that is free of the supremacy of any other City-State. Therewith we have reached a new kind of Hellas, which is to have a considerable career.

SECTION THIRD.

Macedonian Hellas.

We have reached the third stage of Hellenic History proper, which is now to complete its first great cycle embracing the distinctively world-historical career of Greece. We see before us a total Hellas, organized into a State and defended by its own well-disciplined army; both the civilized and the barbarous elements are united, we may say nationalized for the first time — all of which is the work of Philip, who has inoculated the diseased City-State with the fresh blood of its original Proto-Hellenic stock.

The work of his son Alexander is very different. Through the latter, Hellas as a whole is to return to the Orient whence it sprang, even to the Aryan fountain-head in the Highlands of Middle Asia. If Philip brought about the return of civilized Hellas to its own protoplasmic peoples, and thus made an Hellenic nation, Alexander is to take this newly unified Hellenic nation and to lead it far beyond its national bounds in Europe, even to its sources in the Orient, for a draught of its primeval creative being. Why could Alexander never stop till he had penetrated to Bactria and the head-waters of

the Indus? A world-historical deed it was, we hold, whose significance our own age is just beginning consciously to recognize. Moreover Alexander as the greatest man of action whom Hellas produced, has a supra-Hellenic instinct, through which he rises above his national or even his continental limits, and becomes, not merely a Greek or European, but also an Aryan hero.

We have, therefore, to separate Philip from Alexander at this supreme node of Greek History. Philip is indeed the great unifier and organizer of all Hellas, overcoming its inherent separation, its native Polyarchic character. It is true that Philip intended to make the expedition to Asia Minor, where he would probably have freed the Greek cities from Persian rule and united them with the new Greek nationality, making them a part of Macedonian Hellas. But we can hardly conceive of Philip penetrating even to the Euphrates, not to speak of Bactria and India. Philip had the Hellenic instinct, not the Aryan seemingly, and he would have reached Asia too late in life ever to have felt strongly its influence. His twenty-three years' struggle for his principle had of necessity crystallized his spirit into its limits. But Alexander entered the Asiatic world young, receptive, still capable of being moulded by what he saw there. It is a necessary part of his world-his-

torical function that he became more Oriental the further he advanced into the heart of the Orient. Philip at forty-seven was already too hardened to have done this. But Alexander at less than half that age crossing into Asia, and being by nature more poetic, imaginative and impressionable than his father (as we may still read in the face of his statue supposed to be derived from that of Lysippus) was ready to respond mightily to the Oriental Folk-Soul, and to harmonize it with Hellenism. So he hardly stops in his career till he pierces the originative center of the primeval Aryan race of which both the Hellenic and Iranian (Persian) peoples were migratory offshoots. Alexander thus sought and reached the common creative source of both the nations which he would unite.

Philip of course made the implement which Alexander wielded with such consumate effect, causing it to fulfil the purpose of its existence. This implement was the united Hellenic stock of the Greek peninsula, which we have called Macedonian Hellas. The latter had two elements, the Macedonian which was more or less tribal, and the civilized which was that of the City-State. Both these elements remained when transported into the Orient, never losing their mutual antagonism though suppressed by the strong hand of the king. The Macedonian was the soldier and furnished the physical strength

and courage chiefly, despising the lettered Greek (like Eumenes) who did the mental work and who returned the contempt with interest. In a general way it can be said that the one had the will the other the intellect, of the great enterprise. It was the old story of the strife between brawn and brain, between Ajax and Ulysses. On the whole the Macedonian king had the good sense to appreciate both and to harmonize them; in fact Philip, as we have seen, was both, namely a civilized Greek and also a barbarian, and the same may be said of Alexander. So Greek culture goes East with Macedonian might, organizing and in part transforming the Oriental world. Otherwise this Hellenic conquest would have swept over the East and left no trace, as has been the case with so many Asiatic conquerors. But now the Orient is to be Hellenized, transfused with the Hellenic spirit in all its manifestations —art, literature, philosophy. Thus we begin to pass with Alexander out of a purely Hellenic into a Hellenistic period.

Looking at Persia by itself and tracing its share in the world-historical process now taking place, we have to observe, first of all, that it is getting its own; what it did to a part of Greece and tried to do to all Greece, all Greece is now doing to it — namely invading and conquering it from periphery to center. But there is something more than mere retribution in the colossal

lesson. Asia must now be divided up, particularized, made over into many States. That is, the Greeks carry everywhere with them their Polyarchy, really their deepest principle, and will apply it in the Orient after the death of Alexander, who indeed preserves the unity of Hellas and Persia in one vast empire. But see it go to pieces under his generals when his strong hand is removed. That is verily the Greek of this whole business. Asia is to be passed through the Greek Polyarchy, not of City-States however, but of Oriental, largely racial States. The Orient, as we see in its succession of empires, was hostile to particular States. On this ground Persia could not endure the new Hellas and the dawning Europe; it fought the Greco-Persian War to obliterate the European separation. In that struggle Persia was defeated, yet it was able to hold West-Asia together, putting down rebellions. But now the World-Spirit has clearly decreed that the Orient, hitherto so hostile to particularity, is itself to be particularized, is to be cut up into a Polyarchy of particular States. This was specially the work of Alexander's Successors (the so-called Diadochi).

At the same time Alexander and his Succesors did not fail to introduce the Greek city into Asia. Indeed that was a striking part of their policy. The result was that Macedonian Hellas became city-producing in the Orient and

scattered its urban progeny from Egypt to Sogdiana. Still we must recollect that these were not the autonomous City-States of Hellas, but were subordinate to the various kingdoms of Asia, just as at the same time in Greece the City-State was subordinate to the Macedonian power. Nor was it the old Greek colonization in which the mother-city (metropolis) sent forth an independent new City-State to a foreign shore. And yet this Asiatic City-State was a manifestation of the still existent reproductive power of the Greek City-State, which even in captivity begets offspring though captive. Still the Greek City-State quite in the heart of Asia was not devoid of the aspiration for autonomy, and often attained a good share of self-government. It is declared that the kingdom of Parthia was full of Greek towns to which the monarchs granted home rule, requiring only the payment of their regular tax-levy. The city of Seleucia on the Tigris, reported by Pliny to have six hundred thousand inhabitants in the first century of the Christian Era, was a kind of Greek democracy under Parthian supremacy. Of course autonomy in Asia could exist only by a tolerance of sovereigns, who often called themselves on their coins Phil-hellenic; it could have there no such strong self-asserting character as it once had in Greece, where we have followed its vigorous original life.

It may be said that Macedonian Hellas, holding in solution the Greek Polyarchy and the Greek City-State, reproduced them both distinctively in Asia, but not in unity, since it had undone just this unity in Greece. That is, Macedon did not beget in Asia the Polyarchy of autonomous City-States, in putting down which it had won its world-historical destiny. Really autonomus Hellas with its society of City-States had had its day of supremacy, and was historically past, though it still remained an element, even if subordinate, of Hellenic progress. It is the civilized City-State of Hellas, not semi-barbarous Macedon, which can bring Greek civilization to the Orient. So the city-founding on the part of Macedonian rulers, though not evolved directly and not proceeding from within like the old Greek colonization, but done from without by authority, was chiefly what Hellenized the Orient. In such case the Greek City-State, even if under the yoke, is seen to be still performing a great function, being compelled by external command to impart herself to the Oriental world, which task she would not, indeed could not have performed of herself.

Architecturally a whole Asiatic city could be built to order after the most approved Greek pattern. It is probable that Athens chiefly furnished the model, which the architect was commanded to reproduce, doubtless with certain

variations. Many a structural device, such as the cross-arch, passed to Rome in whose ruins we still see it, from these Hellenistic cities of Asia. There is little doubt that the first artistic union of the column and arch was the work of Greek architects in the East. In general the Hellenic City-State, both in its inner municipal organization and in its outer constructive form, was picked up from Greece and set down in the Orient. To be sure there was a considerable difference between the two — the one being self-evolved and the other being an imitation. Also the one was autonomous, and the other in the last instance was heteronomous.

Nor must we omit to note in the present connection that the Greek City-State is also making a grand return to its original civilized fountain head — the fluvial City-State of the Orient in the river-valleys of the Nile and Euphrates. Long before the birth of Hellas and of Europe, Babylon and Nineveh as well as Memphis and Thebes had existed and unfolded the primal Oriental Civilization. This was unquestionably transmitted to early Greece, of whose development it was one of the factors. And it came not directly but largely through a second kind of City-State, the Phenician, lying on the great Inland Sea. Already we have traced the movement into Hellas from the fluvial, through the marine City-State of the East (see preceding pp. 168,

175). Now rises the interesting fact that the Hellenic City-State is also to be brought back to its civilized origin in this mighty refluent wave of Macedonian conquest, along with the return of total Hellas to its racial origin. For the Orient was the primeval source of both physical and spiritual Hellas, much as it differed from its distant ancestor. Two diverse streams they were from the start, yet they finally came together in the Greek Peninsula, where they contributed to the evolution of the Hellenic City-State which is now circling around to its ancient beginnings in the Orient, both to give and to receive. Thus the City-State, claiming to be unique and underived, is sent back to interconnect with its first civilized point of departure, making the round of the East with the Macedonian arms.

It would seem, however, that the Greek City in Asia and the genuine Asiatic City, would not coalesce but continued twain. Seleucus, after trying old Babylon as his capitol for awhile, built new Selencia, only forty-five miles distant on the Tigris, which remained long a great Greek city in the heart of the Orient. The Ptolomies, though making themselves Egyptians in many respects, developed enormously the marine Hellenistic Alexandria instead of restoring Egypt's famous fluvial cities, Memphis and Thebes. In Syria Antioch on the Orontes rose to be the third city of the ancient world, while the

old Phenician sea-cities, Tyre and Sidon, dropped into the background. Thus the Greek City-State, returning to the Orient both on the sea and in the river-valley, had a marvelous rejuvenescence which in wealth and splendor and magnitude, though not in artistic beauty, far outstripped its prototype in Hellas, which was always poor. This flowering of Hellenism in the Orient lasted long under Byzantine rule. But when Islam arose, it began to droop and seemed to die (but did not) under the blow of the barbarous Turk.

Macedon arose from the decay both of the East and the West, both of the Persian Empire and of the Hellenic City-State. The latter fact we have already unfolded; of the former a word may be here said. Persia no longer fulfilled its imperial function in the Oriental sense, it could no longer hold itself together and form one empire. The many revolts in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor and elsewhere, showed it dissolving into its constituent peoples before the Macedonian appeared. The expedition of Cyrus the younger, narrated in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, revealed the inner weakness of the government. In the royal palace the king-maker had risen to the exercise of real sovereignty — this was Bagoas, the eunuch, who had made way with two kings, and put upon the throne one of his friends, Darius Codomannus, not in the direct

line of descent. This was the Persian monarch who had to meet Alexander the Great. Like autonomous Hellas, imperial Persia had long been in conflict with itself, and had undone itself, after having triumphed through Cyrus externally and through the first Darius internally, the latter being the organizer of the huge realm. Thus Persia has in its way gone through the general process which we have observed in the Greek City-State. And Macedon is to unify for a short time the dissolving Asiatic empire, as it unified dissolving Hellas. Still the period has come for inner separation even in West-Asia which has so long been devoted to unity, having witnessed empire after empire for thousands of years. Alexander will seek to preserve and to renew this Oriental tendency to a single political supremacy, but his Successors will soon introduce and maintain the separative bent which they have brought from Greece and Europe. For while Philip and Alexander unified in Greece and in Asia, they had no followers of their principle, except in a relatively limited way.

Macedon and Persia are, accordingly, both Henarchies, the one being Hellenic, the other Oriental; the one is young and incorrupt, the other is old and decayed. But each of them after a brief connection, is to be passed through a long separative Polyarchic development, which

prepares both Hellas and West-Asia for a final union with the Roman imperial republic.

The present stage which we call Macedonian Hellas lasts nearly two centuries, if it be reckoned from Alexander as king till the Roman victory at Corinth. The events of this considerable stretch of time have not been handed down by any contemporary historian, and are in a very disjointed, fragmentary condition. To be sure much has been transmitted from antiquity about Alexander, whose exploits are indeed stranger than romance. But his three chief ancient biographers lived four to five hundred years after his death. On the other hand the grand transformation of the Orient under Alexander's Successors is very imperfectly recorded, and must be pieced together from a variety of sources. Still we can catch its outlines, and in them behold the general sweep of the World's History, of which the present period is an integral part. Of course no great heroic figure appears, like Alexander, or even Themistocles; the World-Spirit seems able to perform its function through lesser men.

The historic movement of Macedonian Hellas has a close resemblance to that of the preceding stage, autonomous Hellas, which indeed it carries overcome yet active in its bosom. It shows a time of triumph followed by a period of self-trituration and self-undoing, when it is subjected

by an external power. That is, we behold Macedonian Hellas (1) as triumphant, (2) as self-conflicting till it undoes itself, (3) as subordinate. Philip appeared and seized the exhausted Polyarchy of Greek City-States; in like manner Rome will appear and seize the exhausted Polyarchy of Empire-States, into which the one realm of Alexander has been divided.

In Rome the movement of the World's History makes a new synthesis over Macedon, which has shown itself unable to unite in a permanent government Greece and the Orient. The Macedonian Henarchy, after a brief meteoric life, goes to pieces and stays in pieces. Its separated and separative States keep the civilized World in continual friction, from which there is but one escape. The World-Spirit, ultimately seeking the State universal, brings forth the Roman Henarchy as a new step toward its supreme end, when the Greek Polyarchy, as Tribe, as City-State, and finally as Empire, has fulfilled its world-historical task.

In a sense it may be said that Macedon has failed because it did not and could not do what Rome did: unite under one governmental form the distracted, self-destroying States which are witnessed both in Greece and Asia. But in a deep positive sense we are to see that Macedon performed its allotted function in History, doing what Rome could never have done: it Hellenized

the Orient, giving to the same a wholly new secular life, which lasted a thousand years. A necessary integral part of the total process of the World's History is Macedonian Hellas, of whose historic career we shall next give a brief outline.

I. *Macedonian Hellas triumphant.* — This is what is incarnated in Alexander the Great: the complete triumph of the idea of Macedonian Hellas, which now unifies not only the Greek Peninsula, but with it Western Asia even to the Indus.

We have already touched upon what we deem to be the basic element of Alexander's career, as well as the deepest instinct of his soul: he had in him not merely a Proto-Hellenic (or Macedonian), but also a Proto-Aryan strand; he was made of that primeval racial stuff from which originally both Persia and Hellas were formed, and thus he was able to sympathize with Iranian as well as Greek. We call him not simply a Greek hero (like Hercules) but an Aryan one, since his deeds penetrate to the deepest layer underlying both European and Asiatic peoples, whose primordial separation he first sought to reach and overcome. Seemingly he would reverse all the racial divisions and migrations of thousands of years, and restore the primal Aryan unity. Perhaps he is the only real Aryan hero known to History; even prosaic skeptical Mr.

Grote talks at times as if there was something superhuman in Alexander. Of course the Mythus of peoples both in Europe and Asia has taken him up and celebrated his marvelous exploits after its fashion. In Persian legend he appears as Ischander whom Firdousi glorifies in his Schah Nameh. On the whole we shall have to deem him the greatest man of action whom Hellas brought forth, making the deepest and also the widest synthesis in his career: he mediated with the World-Spirit not merely the Macedonian or the total Hellenic Folk-Soul, but he reached down to its Aryan substrate uniting Europe and Asia.

Like most of the other Great Men of Greece, Alexander may well be deemed tragic in the final outcome of his greatness. That limit put upon him by his soldiers at the river Hyphanis when they refused to go farther, was the spiritual end of Alexander, and was the chief ground of his physical end not long thereafter. He had indeed attained the originative center of the Aryan race, and had overcome its Western divisions from Greece to Bactria. But now his deepest ambition—let us call it his instinct of racial unity—drives him forward to overcome also its Eastern divisions and migrations even to the valley of the Ganges. But he is stopped by his own people whose will, as voiced by one of his officers (see Arrian's *Anabasis* V. 25) is now to return, to go back through West-Asia even to Hellas,

and thus to complete the Greco-Asiatic round already vast. Alexander has to yield, but it kills him; he has to recognize a bound to his own deepest Self, to his Aryan aspiration, if we grasp him aright. Internally broken he starts back and soon after completing the march dies at Babylon, some say of poison, but most say of dissipation which was so intense and prolonged that it meant despair, suicide. At any rate he had run upon the boundary line of his destiny, which was racial unification; when he could no longer unify Asia and Europe he had reached his fate spiritually, which shortly became a real physical fate.

We should also take a note of that Macedonian army which had so faithfully followed him and which was his instrument. Very striking is here the power of Demos declaring itself against the greatest Monarchos. It is what ultimately rules, even in Macedon; the Folk-soul must dominate at last even when the ruler falls out with it and collides with its will. This collision is really what makes Alexander tragic: his spirit and that of his people have become twain, and he goes down in the conflict. His career comes to an end when he no longer represents the Folk-soul or when he can no longer bring it to represent him and to fulfil his deepest aspiration. We shall see him trying to employ the Persian instead of the Macedonian for realizing his purpose, but

he cannot well change Folk-souls, not even the hero can cut loose from his own people.

Alexander profoundly assimilated Homer, it is said, under the tutelage of the philosopher Aristotle; he became to himself a kind of Achilles, whom he was to re-enact upon a far wider stage. It is a suggestive remark of Hegel that Hellas, the ever youthful, opens and closes with two youthful heroes, Achilles and Alexander. Certainly the career of Alexander has in it a strange epical fascination, as if it were Homer realized before our eyes, metamorphosed into historic deeds with more than an Olympian colossality. Of this actual Homeric epos we can here simply note the main crises.

(*a*) It was the first and fundamental task of young Alexander, as soon as he had ascended the throne, to secure Macedonian Hellas, which had been united and held together by the strong hand of Philip. After the latter's death there was the tendency in it everywhere to fly asunder into its original constituents. In Thrace, in Illyria, in Greece separative movements at once began. By overcoming these dissident elements, and re-uniting them into one government, Alexander showed not only his ability but also the bent of his genius, which was to put down tribal, national, and finally racial separation. In fact he had to begin his work of unity in his own family, which presented several claimants to his

throne, and Macedon itself was on the point of being torn by civil broils. Herein he proceeded, as usual, rapidly and remorselessly. His two nearest rivals, though of his blood, he slew, or caused to be slain, as well as others who might be leaders in trouble. Having unified thus his family and Macedonia, he starts for Greece, which has begun to ferment again under its old impulse of autonomy. In about two months after the death of Philip, we read with surprise that Alexander with a large army has crossed the pass of Thermopylæ and is at Thebes, a chief center of discontent. Athens, hitherto applauding her orators with their grandiose declamations against the Macedonian tyrant, now sends to him an humble apology with submission, recognizing him as head of Greece, and conferring upon him divine honors. So much has Athens changed. Alexander marches by rather contemptuously, passes into the Peloponnesus, whose cities humbly submit with the one stubborn exception, Sparta. Then, in imitation of his father, he calls a synod of the former Polyarchy of Greek City-States to meet him at Corinth.

This synod is worthy of more than a passing notice. It shows the ever-living aspiration of Greece for autonomy, which she could no longer maintain by her own strength. It also indicates the way in which the Macedonian kings used this aspiration for their own ends. First of

all the synod of Corinth proclaimed Alexander to be the head of Greece, the controller of its inter-urban relations, and the generalissimo of its army for the conquest of Asia. On the other hand in the same agreement each Hellenic City-State was declared to be free and autonomous; no other City-State was to interfere with it or to abet its enemies; the existing constitution of each, democratic, aristocratic, monarchic, was to remain unchanged; even a tyrant was neither to be set up nor pulled down. The sea was to be open to all, to be a *mare liberum*, for commerce; no maritime captures were allowed, no armed vessel of one city could enter the harbor of another city. There is no doubt that this subtle piece of work was originally the scheme of Philip's brain, which Alexander re-enacted. The Polyarchy of Greek City-States is completely separated within and atomized; their sole center of unity is in the Macedonian monarch. It has striking points of resemblance to Rome's later plan of dealing with the same problem. Here we have what may be called the Macedonian definition of autonomy. It is true that the same view was implicit in the leading Greek City-States; Athens, Sparta, Thebes we have seen proclaiming autonomy but suppressing it when it conflicted with their Hegemony. Hereafter the Macedonian rulers will keep up their play upon this deepest Greek sentiment. (These significant

transactions of the synod of Corinth are not given in any Greek historian, but by a kind of chance have come down to us in a speech published in the works of Demosthenes, but falsely ascribed to him. It is, however, a contemporary document, and bears the name *On the Treaty*).

Having thus settled civilized Greece, as he thought, Alexander hastens to the backward tribal elements of his kingdom to the peoples in the northern portion of the Greek peninsula. He reaches the Danube and even crosses it, subduing the Thracians of those parts. We hear of a tribe of Gauls seeking his friendship. The Illyrians are next subjected, and we find later a contingent of them in his Asiatic army. Through these rapid and victorious movements he secures the Proto-Hellenic element of Macedonian Hellas, and draws upon it for soldiers in his forthcoming Oriental campaign.

Scarcely is the task in the North completed when Alexander hears that civilized Greece in the South is seething with plots against him, and that Thebes has already revolted (335 B. C.). By a quick march he sweeps down and destroys Thebes, terrorizes Athens, and re-establishes his authority throughout Greece, always with the one exception. Yea the second exception is found by Alexander at Corinth during this visit: the Cynic philosopher Diogenes in his tub asks nothing of the great conqueror, except that "you

stand out of my sunshine." One Greek is determined not to be dependent on him, and the young hero salutes this assertion of freedom with "if I were not Alexander, I would be Diogenes."

Thus Alexander has suppressed all the recalcitrant elements of the total Greek Peninsula, and has fully re-confirmed the authority of Philip. So he is ready to take the next step.

(*b*) This is the expedition to Asia. It is a curious fact that both sides (Macedonian and Persian) appeal in this conflict to a world-justice which each claims that the other has violated (see the letter of Darius and Alexander's reply after the battle of Issus, Arrian II. 14). Of course these appeals are hardly more than pretexts. Each side could easily convict the other of injustice and could cite not only historical but mythical instances, as Herodotus does (Book I at the beginning). It was autonomous Greece which Persia had assailed under Darius and Xerxes, and which Philip and Alexander had put down. Therein Persia and Macedon were alike. A far deeper ground must be sought for in Alexander's career, whose real, even if unconcious trend was to overcome the dualism between Hellas and the Orient.

A typical, indeed presentimental act of Alexander was that, when he crossed into Asia, he hastened to Troy and identified himself with heroic Greece in its attack upon Asia. Xerxes,

when he invaded Greece had paid a similar visit, though he was going the other way. Both recognizing the Trojan War as the prototype of the mighty conflict between Greece and Asia. Moreover Alexander claimed descent from Achilles, whose task he was about to complete. Indeed the Macedonians were much nearer to the Homeric Greeks that to the contemporary civilized Greeks. Alexander had assimilated Homer's world, he was a return to heroic Greece, to the Trojan conflict, from which he now takes his starting-point. Nor did he neglect that Homeric realm of the Gods; to both Zeus and Athena he made sacrifice on the hill of Ilium. Priam's wrathful ghost he sought to appease by offerings, as in a way representing the assailed Orient with which the Greek conqueror is to be finally reconciled and united. Macedonian Hellas we behold in this forecasting act of its Great Man going back to Early Hellas, and inter-linking the historic with the mythical age.

By the battle of Granicus (334 B.C.) Alexander gets hold of the Anatolian Peninsula, with its clusters of Greek cities. The next year he wins the battle of Issus, capturing the mother, wife and son of Darius. After the siege of Tyre he gets Phenicia with its navy, and now for the first time he has maritime superiority. Syria having submitted to him, he passes to Egypt which also yields. There he founds Alexandria,

seemingly his first work of the kind. He has now mastered the East-Mediterranean world, but that is not enough. He passes into the great and rich river-valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, with its old famous cities.

These unparalled victories were won primarily with the implement inherited by the son from the father, the army of Macedon with its *sarissa* and *phalanx*. Already we have noted how Philip transcended the military device which Epaminondas had used against the Spartan discipline so successfully at Leuctra. The memorable Macedonian phalanx had as its unit the company (syntagma) sixteen men square — two hundred and fifty-six men combined into a kind of sledge hammer bristling with its long pikes (sarissæ). The skillful commander mauled the enemy's ranks with this sledge-hammer, yea with many of them smiting together and quickly breaking to pieces any line of battle opposed to him. No longer single combat as in Homer's time, nor rows of soldiers drawn up several men deep, but the organized fist of war we behold with its hitting power increased many times. It was this weapon that slew the Theban Sacred Band at Chæroneia, which could not reach the man, but could be reached by the man, thrusting that long *sarissa*, which, in the hands of the Macedonian front lines, made up of picked men exceptionally strong and specially trained, would

skewer the Thebans, who at most might hurl their spears, which were then lost. Philip himself during his long stay at Thebes, learned its military discipline, which it was his prime function to surpass. The phalanx, however, had its limits, it was cumbrous, it could not wheel well or move nimbly, it could not be employed for light work, it was the sledge-hammer in the shop. Hence the other branches of military service — cavalry, peltasts, bowmen, slingers, etc. — supplied various needs, but were necessary to the work of the phalanx. Here we should note that Philip's army was an image of his whole spirit: it had a strong central unit (the phalanx) which dominated the entire military organization, whose other parts, hitherto more or less independent (like the City-State) were made to circle about and subserve the one supreme body of soldiers which was Macedonian — the subordinate service being made up chiefly of Greeks and Barbarians (quite as their States were subordinate).

One incident of Alexander's stay in Egypt must be specially noticed: He pays a visit to the temple of Zeus Ammon in the desert, and is saluted by the priest as the son of the God. This seems to have been a turning-point in the inner development of Alexander, who henceforth began to lay claim to divinity. At the same time such a claim was ridiculed by the skeptical Greeks and resented by many Macedonian offi-

cers. The latter deemed it an insult to Philip, and an alienation began to spring up between them and their leader, which will bear deadly fruit hereafter. The psychological ground of Alexander's conduct in this matter has been variously interpreted. Plutarch bases it upon a political motive, which had the design of impressing his Oriental subjects in a way most natural to them, through religion. Grote explains it merely as one more instance of an enormous personal vanity. We believe that Alexander was working out his own native bent, he was Orientalizing himself as he penetrated the Orient. Such a change came from no premeditated plan. It has long been observed that the Oriental monarch is regarded as divine — a view which lies in the nature of the Oriental mind. This metamorphosis of Alexander must be seen as a genuine, yea as a necessary part of his evolution, as he becomes more harmonious with and absorbed into the Orient.

Alexander crosses the Euphrates at Thapsacus, and then the Tigris near ancient Nineveh, when he comes upon and defeats the Persian king in the battle often called Arbela (better Gaugamela), this being the third and last victory over Darius (331 B. C). The great and fertile river-valley yields to him at once; the three chief cities Babylon, Susa, and then Persepolis, are taken and plundered. In particular he sought to anni-

hilate Persepolis, the ancient capital of that people (the Persians) who had invaded Greece and burnt Athens. Thus he had fulfilled the retribution which was the oft-proclaimed object of the invasion. Like the poetical hero of epos and tragedy, he brings to the guilty doer the consequences of the deed after generations.

And now Alexander enters upon the third and final part of his conquest of Asia, in many respects the most difficult. It is also the longest part in time, lasting four years till he turns back at the river Hyphanis (330-326 B. C.), since from Granicus to Gaugamela lay only three years. A vast territory he traverses, chiefly mountainous, inhabited by warlike peoples, but incapable of combining against him. It appears to have been the original function of the Persian Empire to give to these scattered masses a kind of loose unity and inner peace. Seemingly they were of the Aryan race in the main, more closely allied to the Iranian branch than any other, to which branch the ruling Persians also belonged. Alexander goes next to Media, which had been conjoined with Persia in her conquests. He takes its capital, but hurries on to capture Darius, who, however, is slain by his own officers. Thence Alexander pushes forward till he comes to Proto-Aryan Bactria, where he marries beautiful Roxana, a daughter of the land, and his

first wedded wife, in whom his heart may well feel the heart of Arya.

Alexander has now penetrated to the early seats of the Aryan race, the germinal unit from which both Greek and Persian originally sprang. He crosses the large river Oxus, and subdues Sogdiana, that debatable land over which Iran and Turan seem to have fought their earliest racial battles. These he, the greatest Aryan hero, is fighting over again in his way. He reaches the distant Jaxartes, on whose banks he founds one of his cities, as the extreme outpost of his empire.

This instinct of racial heroship Alexander felt, we hold, and it expressed itself in him in this way: he conceived himself to be the son of a God, like Hercules and many an other mythical hero. But he no longer lives in a mythical or even religious age, so it comes that in defence of his divine selfhood he murders his friend Clitus, who questions it, to be sure in a drunken debauch at Maracanda, capitol of Sogdiana. Previously two of his highest officers, Philotas and Parmenio, son and father, he had caused to be put to death, ostensibly on account of a conspiracy, but really because they, or the son at least, criticised his divinity. The same fate for the same offence overtakes Callisthenes, a Greek philosopher in his retinue.

But Alexander is not yet done with the conquering of primeval Arya, of which there is still

a district, probably a central district, remaining unvisited by his arms. He crosses southward from Bactria the mountain range called Parapamisus (Hindoo-Koosh), and passes the upper Indus (326 B. C.), into ancient India, the home doubtless of the Sanscrit. This is now known as the Punjab (land of the Five Rivers), where Alexander encounters the Indian King Porus, and, after conquering him, forms an alliance with him as friend, feeling possibly some remote kinship, for certainly he is treated by Alexander with a remarkable magnanimity and even sympathy, receiving back not only his land but being made seemingly king of the whole Punjab.

Alexander marches on till he reaches the most southern of the five rivers, beyond which is a desert which has to be crossed ere the valley of the Ganges can be reached, where is reported to be another and much greater Indian Kingdom. The youthful conqueror is eager to press forward, but his old soldiers halt and say no. For the first time a limit is put upon Alexander's ever-advancing, limit-transcending nature by his own people, both officers and men. It is to him a great crisis, probably the greatest of his life. Already there has been discontent, still he has been always able to overcome it and to sweep ahead. Behold! now it refuses to be allayed.

The entire Macedonian army suddenly resolves itself into a Demos, or an assembly of the people,

before whom Alexander has to appear as one of the speakers discussing his side of the case, and urging his hearers to continue till "we have traversed the whole of Asia." Then one of his officers replies to him on the other side, voicing the feelings of the army, which wishes now to turn back homeward, deeming that it has completed its task. Loud applause follows the speech of the officer (Coenus by name), and many even shed tears. So it came about that those three elemental forces of the political order — Demos, Aristos and Monarchos — burst up and deliberated together, "on the rim of the habitable world" in the pinch of destiny. The fact is they have been seen before now rising to the surface of this Macedonian army in the case of Philotas, and also in that of Clitus. Demos previously has yielded to Monarchos, but at present the many-headed monster seems to have become intractable to its supposed absolute ruler.

Which will triumph in this new conflict? The next day Alexander calls the same men together, and tells them that he intends to march on, and let those stay behind who will. Still Demos is obstinate. But after hiding himself two more days in his tent and taking an Achillean sulk which produces no signs of a change in his soldiery, Alexander comes out and declares himself ready to turn back. There is no doubt that such a resolution cost him a tremendous inner struggle.

It was Homer over again, for there was the embassy to him, made up of his dearest friends and companions supplicating him to be reconciled with his people. At first he refused, and defiantly proposed to proceed. Then he gave up his Achillean wrath like Achilles; but notably he yielded that self-will of his, hitherto untrammeled and untameable, particularly when the sacrifices were declared not favorable to the advance. Having erected twelve lofty altars, "as high as high towers and much broader," he wheels about, beginning a new stage of his career both internally and externally. (The special biographers of Alexander, Arrian and Quintus Curtius, have strongly emphasized in their way this pivotal act of Alexander's life, giving an account of the popular assembly and a report of the speeches made before it, on each side. But both are inferior writers, and quite fulfil Alexander's presentiment that he would have no Homer to celebrate his heroship as had Achilles, whom he deemed his ancestor).

(*c*) So we have reached the return of Alexander, which ought to have been the complete rounding-out of his vast territorial conquests, and also of his even vaster self-conquest. To organize and solidify what he has won could well have been the grand work of a life-time, but really his career is finished. He carries out his projected maritime scheme through Near-

chos, and has other naval plans. Still when he leaves his old Aryan mother whom he has so heroically sought and regained, having tarried upon her breast the better part of two years in the Punjab (327–6 B.C.), the nourishing fountain of of his genius seems to be cut off at once, and with it soon fails the nourishing fountain of life itself.

We may conceive him retracing his steps northward, quite broken-hearted, with a presentiment of what is soon to come. For Alexander was a man of far-stretching imagination, as well as of the deepest instinct reaching down, as we have seen, to the bed-rock of his race. He goes back to the first of the Five Rivers (not including the Indus), which is the Hydaspes—the Hyphanis where he was stopped being the last or the most southern. Thus he traverses once more his beloved Punjab (such a term we have a right to use, judging by his actions); there he builds a fleet and floats down through the same territory and its rivers which debouch gradually one into the other till they all pour into the Hyphanis, which, then empties into the Indus. To Porus he hands over the government of the country. Roxana goes too, whom we may deem his Proto-Aryan spouse, the fair Bactrian princess who was doubtless his first real love, since his former relation to Barsine seems to have been left-handed. Moreover she brings

him an heir, the second Alexander of fateful memory.

Thus Alexander we may say has had to reverse his destiny, having henceforth to travel backward, not forward as hitherto. Can he do it without its killing him, or perchance without his killing himself? He floats down the Indus as the outer limit of his limit-leaping conquests, and hence as the inner bound of his bound-bursting spirit. Hitherto he has been the victorious counterpart to defeated Xerxes; but now he too has to turn back homeward, unsubdued in battle but vanquished by his own troops. He, having tracked the Aryan migration westward to its very source, would gladly have followed the Aryan migration eastward to the valley of the Ganges; but that is not a portion of his world-historical task, being reserved for a much later time and people. Rome, however, never went so far eastward as did Alexander, never had the same ability of leadership in the Orient, and probably never possessed the same deep Aryan instinct as Alexander.

Having concluded his voyage which is said to have lasted ten months, he disembarked at the mouth of the Indus and began to cross the country toward the Euphrates. After many hardships he reached old Persis, where he visited the tomb of Cyrus at Pasargadæ, which he carefully restored, and punished those who were charged

with pillaging it. He also went to Persepolis and showed regret for his former devastation of the Persian capital. In fact his mood is wholly changed from what it was on his first entrance into ancient Persis some six years before. Then he was still Hellenic, avenging the invasion of Xerxes. But now he has become himself a a Persian at heart, and regards himself as the successor of Darius. He continues his journey to Susa, the later imperial capital, where he marries two Persian princesses of the royal house. His dress, his manners, the ceremonial of his court become Persian. Eighty of his chief officers and friends he causes to take Persian wives of the noblest families. Really he seeks to join in wedlock Hellas and Asia. A new Asiatic army he levies and drills, intending to get rid of his unwilling Macedonian soldiers, who had compelled him to turn back at the river Hyphanis. His whole behavior shows a complete change in his career; instead of subjecting Persia to Macedon, as he has done heretofore, he purposes to subordinate Macedon to Persia. That was probably his resolution already when he turned back from the river Hyphanis. The limit put upon him there he will transcend through a rehabilitation of the Persian empire. Then he can again be divinized, which the Greek consciousness will not permit in a mortal, at least not till it loses its true

character. But the Oriental mind easily makes its ruler unlimited, absolute, investing him with the attributes of a God. We have noted that the further he penetrated into the old Aryan lands, the more he demanded deification, or rather longed for it. Hence came his uncontrollable resentment at its refusal, which culminated in the horrible murders of his own best friends in Bactria. That limit to his empire at the Hyphanis was a limit to his Godhood, for a God ought to be unlimited; it was the negation of his divinity in deeds far stronger than words.

We must not omit the Persian influence upon Alexander. What the Greeks naturally refused, the Persians naturally granted. At first they felt repugnance and enmity to their conqueror, who requited it as we have seen. But they became reconciled to him and he to them. In the Iranian part of the empire he stayed longer than anywhere else; in fact he spent his chief energies in making the total circuit of it—say from Persepolis and Susa back to these cities. Six years the round lasted; when he returned he had taken the Iranian world into himself, had appropriated it and was transformed by it; he had become Iranian. He restored substantially the Persian empire with its satrapies and its organization otherwise. The Persians were largely light-worshippers, the sun rising from the West was not theirs, but when it came back to them out of

the East, they could adore it, as harmonious with the course of their own sun-god. It was dark Ahriman who smote them from the West, but it was Ormuzd who rose with his beneficent light out of the East. Then he openly became polygamous on his return to Persia—which was a change not only from Greek consciousness, but also from himself in Bactria; when he married Roxana, he seems to have been still monogamous. In the basic institution, the Family, he renounces Greece and Europe, and turns Oriental.

It would be interesting to know whether Alexander, or any one of the many learned men in his train, was even remotely conscious of the relationship between himself and the Persian or other Aryan peoples, who were first conquered and then affiliated with in some deeper bond of sympathy overcoming their hate. Both sides could hardly help hearing words in their respective tongues which sounded alike, particularly the common words of life expressing the domestic relations, primitive employments and even the Gods. But we can catch no certain indication of any such knowledge. And yet this affinity is what the modern reader asks after, having been made familiar to him by the new science of Comparative Philology. But such a question is seemingly not yet a hundred years old. Still we hold that the feeling of common origin and blood was present and at work underneath,

though not conscious. That same tie of affinity which we see in the roots of speech, must have lain deep in the racial instincts of both peoples. So we have to interpret Alexander by our recent science of the Nineteenth Century; we may know him better than even the Greek could — know his deep propelling racial instinct, which sought to restore and for a brief moment did restore the unity of Arya out of its primeval separation. Such was the chief strain of his genius, which could fore-feel and strive to return to that far-off racial consanguinity which had been lost by migration, war, and the lapse of uncounted centuries.

But with these last acts of his, in which he Persianzes his army and his government, the career of Alexander closes. Really he has sought to undo his work, and he has undone himself. He strives to make the Macedonian conquest vanish into the Persian empire, which then has triumphed. Hephaestion, seemingly his best Macedonian friend, dies of a fever at Egbatana. Uncontrollable sorrow comes over Alexander, as if he feels in that death a premonition of his own fate. For what has a Macedonian to do in the new order but to die? He builds at Babylon an enormous funeral pile for his friend Hephaestion, and celebrates with untold magnificence the obsequies, which may almost be regarded as his own, so soon afterwards does his own death follow.

The authorities agree that the immediate cause of his sudden demise was an excessive indulgence in drink. But he had undone himself; starting out to punish the Mede, he had ended by Medizing (to use the old Greek conception common in the war with Xerxes). On the other hand he had temporarily united Hellas and West-Asia. But this evanescent political union is not the true result of Alexander's conquest.

Perhaps it is permissible to take as the last expression of Alexander his colossal monument to Hephæstion — an enormous quadrangular pyramid, "each side being a furlong" and the whole seven stories high, decorated with the various forms of Greek and Oriental art. In the sixth story were placed "the arms of Macedonians and Barbarians" lying side by side, in peace — symbolic of his present mind. The fourth story "showed a battle of the Centaurs," famed in Greek legend; the fifth story had "lions and bulls alternately, all in gold," well-known figures on Assyrian and Persian monuments. Highest were "forms of Sirens made hollow and containing the singers of the dirge to the departed" to whom sacrifices were offered "as to a God." In this vast ceremony Alexander must have been thinking of himself, pre-enacting his own funeral rites and his own apotheosis. Many were the bodeful signs of his coming demise; Babylon, full of Chaldæan sooth-

sayers re-echoed to him their fore-warnings. What a crushing presentiment must have hung over that city and Alexander during the ominous celebration! Even in the dry pages of Diodorus written centuries later, one may feel the presaging bent of the time which overlaps and supplants the skeptical vein of the Greek philosophers (see his *Bibl. Hist.* XVII 114–6, ed. Dindorf).

II. *Macedonian Hellas in conflict with itself.* No sooner was the strong grip of Alexander relaxed in death than his vast empire flew to pieces, showing a tendency to resolve itself into its original ethnic units. To be sure there was for a time something of attempt to keep the whole together for Alexander's heir; but the first question to be settled was: Who can he be—this heir of Alexander? His children or some one of the royal Macedonian family? Or is there another law of inheritance about to make itself valid? At least there comes an overwhelming lurch toward separation of the colossal mass of nations which Alexander has externally lashed together. That deep instinct of racial unity which we have found to be the key of his career and which has sought to conjoin Hellas and West-Asia, is now overslaughed by the opposite trend, which we may call Hellenic or indeed European. An irrestible Polyarchic wave succeeds the Henarchic bent of Alexander, with its

Oriental consolidation of peoples. Nobody inherited, could inherit his feeling of Aryan unity along with the ability to make it actual.

In fact the World-Spirit in its peculiar way has decreed that Alexander has finished his task of unification, which is after all but a half of the total sweep of the age. There must be also national and political diversity in the complete movement of History. Alexander, as we see especially in his later acts, would have wiped out the Hellenic element of his own people, he would have Orientalized Hellas, and did so up to a certain point. But now the Orient is to be Hellenized, yea to be Europeanized politically and secularly by Greece and Rome, till its turn comes to Orientalize Europe through its own special gift, religion. At present however, the Orient is to be Hellenized, is to take up and conjoin harmoniously Hellenic culture with its own.

First and foremost, therefore, the Hellenic political norm is to be applied in the East, which norm is that of a Polyarchy of States. Not indeed of City-States: the one Oriental empire of Alexander is to be divided up into a multiplicity of what may be called Empire-States; the one becomes many. Why should it? We may answer, the World-Spirit has so decreed, or Universal History has proceeded that way in its own right. Yet we wish to see into the ground of this world-historical process, which is at last a

manifestation of something higher than itself, even if the historian takes it as the grand finality. The separative stage is a stage of Universal History because this in its supreme sense is a stage or part of the Universe itself (as Pampsychosis). Already we have designated Asia as essentially unitary while Europe is essentially divisive (pp. 67-69), both being stages of the process of Universal History, which is, however, but one form, in which the All as Self is perpetually revealing itself.

The time before us is accordingly one of separation fundamentally, though it be a part (the second) of the grand return of Hellas upon Asia, which we have already designated as the third stage of independent Hellenic History. It is known as the age of Alexander's successors (Diadochi); to the one ruler succeed many rulers. Moreover these many rulers with their Empire-States conflict, are indeed in a continuous struggle with one another, for each is seeking to prevent absorption, and to absorb the rest. Thus the old collision between Polyarchy and Henarchy is renewed under different forms, and in a different series of historic events. The parallelism is striking: as we saw autonomous Hellas composed of its City-States in a round of conflict with itself which makes it self-undoing, so now we are to see Macedonian Hellas composed of Empire-States in a round of conflict

with itself, which likewise makes it self-undoing. Both call up the outsider to control them, when they prove to be unable to control themselves after long trial: this outsider is in one instance Philip, in the other is Rome.

The present age is often named the Hellenistic, since Hellas is Hellenizing the Orient, and in fact the world, going later to Rome not by arms but by culture, which is really that of the autonomous Greek City-State. Thus it is a missionary time, a raying out from a center of light over the East and then the West. The Greek language becomes the universal tongue, modified much from its Attic delicacy and vulgarized into a kind of *lingua franca*, for the purpose of military command, commerce, and social intercourse between a vast number of polyglot peoples. So the Greek intellectual treasures are scattered far and wide. On the other hand the material treasures of Persia, hoarded in fabulous quantities at the Persian capitals chiefly, are seized and scattered among the people through the soldiery. Persia consolidated the precious metals of her wide domains by storing them away in enormous piles, massifying them like her empire, and destroying their purpose as a circulating medium. The economic condition of the East must have been much improved by such a large increase in the means of exchange. Money, becoming suddenly plentiful, was applied to im-

provements, and especially to the building of cities, which became a kind of mania and rendered possible the monumental transference of Greek architecture into the Orient.

It is handed down that Alexander being asked on his death-bed to whom he transmitted his empire, replied: *To the strongest.* It is also declared that one of his last acts was to take off his signet-ring and to give it to Perdiccas, implying the transfer of his power. Both these facts would seem to indicate that his empire was to remain united. But a prophecy of the coming disolution is also credited to him in his last moments.

Of course there is no intention here of following out in detail the multitudinous fluctuations of the Macedonian empire under Alexander's Successors. Its history has come down to us in fragments, and these are mostly of later authors. It is another historic vortex like the second period of Autonomous Hellas already described, but the area of it is far greater, including the Greek Peninsula and West-Asia as well as the intermediate Asia Minor, all of which show the one general tendency to separation into lesser States mutually antagonistic.

(*a*) We may put the first half century after the death of Alexander into a sub-period with its own special tendency and character, showing the sudden break-up of his vast empire and the

movement of the pieces into several new empires, so that the outcome is what we call a Polyarchy of Empire-States. This is the chief political contrast of it with the previous Greek world, or the Polyarchy of City-States. There will be in it consequently the same struggle between Polyarchy and Henarchy, though in a different form, yea we shall see repeated the conflict between Autonomy and Heteronomy, though the conflicting units now are empires (or kingdoms) instead of cities. We shall find that one of these empires is always the greatest, and has the ambitious monarch who is seeking or is suspected of seeking supreme sway, whereat the others begin to fight, and are able to thwart any universal domination.

First then is the genesis of the Polyarchy of Empire States, otherwise called the division of Alexander's one realm into the many ones of his Successors, which after fifty years of conflict settle down into three main Empire-States, two in Asia (Egypt and Syria,) and one in Europe, (Macedonia including the Greek Peninsula). Asia Minor also divides within itself. The whole is a long process of putting down the unitary or Henarchic principle, which keeps rising in the various Empire-States as it did in the various City-States, and then is suppressed in one way or other. Thus the Hellenic separation makes itself valid again in the political world

and there rises an inter-imperial relation (not inter-national, as these empires in the main do not divide on the line of nationality, though this is a strong factor).

Naturally the first division of the empire after the decease of Alexander was into its provinces or satrapies, of which there were twenty or more (variously given), each with its own governor, who had the tendency to be independent. But over them all was put a regent for the heir (a kind of Grand Vizier) whose function was to maintain the unity of the empire. The first of these was Perdiccas, who was slain in Egypt by Macedonian soldiers; with his death largely vanished the power of his office, though several other imperial regents succeded him. Then the royal family itself was wiped out, both women and children — one sister of Philip alone surviving. Thus all who represented the unity of the empire were taken off. Next the five leading governors assume the title of kings, each having his own independent government. These five are Ptolemy possessed of Egypt, Seleucus of Babylonia, Lysimachus of Thrace, Cassander of Macedonian Hellas, Antigonus of most of Asia. The last is regarded as the dangerous man by the rest, and so is eliminated at the battle of Ipsus (301 B. C.), whereupon Seleucus gets the lion's share of his territories, becoming thereby himself the dangerous man, especially after he has

defeated and slain Lysimachus at the battle of Corupedion (281 B. C.). But before Seleucus can seize his prey, he is murdered by Ptolemy Ceraunus, who is soon slain by the Gauls (280 B. C.). In general all attempts at preserving the unity of Alexander's empire have now failed; the regents, the royal family, and several ambitious kings have been swept down by the stronger tendency to separation. The Polyarchy of Empire-States is accepted as established, and another somewhat different current sets in.

(*b*). The present outcome is that three leading Empire-States, Egypt under the Ptolemies, Syria under Seleucids, and Macedonia under the Antigonids, have settled their respective dynasties if not all their dynastic troubles, have become separately autonomous (as Empire-States), and each remains in one family of kings for many years. Like the three City-States of the former period — Sparta, Athens, Thebes — they still rasp against one another; but the chief process now is an inner one, they begin to divide within. The account of this process we shall omit in the case of Syria and Egypt, the two Oriental Empire-States. The Greek Peninsula will be briefly considered with some glances at Asia Minor, which also shows a tendency to be a Polyarchy in itself, though of lesser States.

The cities of central Greece never abandoned

their ideal of autonomy even in the time of Alexander. While he was still conquering in Asia, Sparta revolted and was put down by Antipater. At the news of Alexander's death, Athens with other cities began to stir against Macedonian sway, and produced a new hero Leosthenes, who won an important battle in the Lamian war and then was killed. He had no successor and the rebellion was quickly suppressed. Most of the Macedonian rulers in Asia wished to get Hellas as the origin of their military power and of Greek civilization, both of which were the great forces moving the Orient. Hence they will play upon that strongest Greek sentiment, autonomy, promising it often but with little intention of fulfilment. At last Antigonus Gonatas after many vissitudes becomes settled on the throne of Macedon in Europe (from about 278 till his death 239 B. C. His descendants (the Antigonids) retain the kingdom for more than a century till the battle Pydna (168 B. C.)

During this time the Antigonids seek to maintain the supremacy of Macedon in Greece as won and transmitted by Philip. On the whole they were kept busy. The barbarous tribes of the North and West, to whom the Gauls must be added, kept making predatory attacks. But in civilized historic Greece two elements, an old and a new, rose up to disturb the Macedonian sway.

The City-State was still ready upon a good opportunity to seize arms for autonomy; Athens had to be subdued more than once, and Sparta in revolt met with a crushing defeat at the battle of Sellasia (221 B. C.). A new principle, or rather an old principle with new life, began to show itself — the league, which had two main representatives during this time, the Achæan, and the Aetolian. Chiefly, however, an external power, Rome, started to interfere in the Greek world, and finally overthrew the Macedonian sway, doing to Macedon what Macedon two hundred years before had done to the rest of Greece.

Four Macedonian wars with Rome are usually set down in the histories of the period. Really at the close of the second war which ended with the battle of Cynoscephalæ (197 B.C.), the power of Macedon was broken. Flamininus, the Roman victor, proclaimed at the Isthmian games (in 196 B. C.), the autonomy of all the City-States of Hellas, thus undoing wholly the work of the great Philip, and restoring the country to what it deemed its time of supreme glory. Only this freedom is the act of an outsider and springs not from the inside — an ominous fact. The Syrian monarch Antiochus rightly sees that his government too must end, if autonomy prevails; he advances into Greece with an army, but is defeated at Thermopylæ (191 B. C.) by Glabrio,

and the following year by Scipio Asiaticus at Magnesia in Asia Minor, which country is now lost to the Syrian monarchy. It is evident that these victories have destroyed all of Philip's work and a part of Alexander's. The real result is that Greece is completely disunited, atomized and de-nationalized. Against this extreme division and enfeeblement, a notable Hellenic current sets in.

(*c*) The Achaean League has already been noticed. A few small and poor towns lying in the Peloponnesus along the Northern shore of the Corinthian Gulf, have formed a federated government, which has a considerable career and is the glory of these last years of independent Greece. Moreover it produces another pair of great Greeks, truly heroic figures, Aratus and Philopoemen, not to speak of a worthy group of lesser men. Thus Hellas, as it were in its expiring agonies, seeks a new remedy for its political ills, though this be too late. The Achaean league transcends the narrowness of autonomy, and therein distinctly rises above the Greek political consciousness generally by seeking to unite the separative City-State into one government, perchance into one nation. On the other hand it does away with the outside power like that of Macedon.

In its revived form the Achaean league began nearly with the Antigonids, being directed really

against the Macedonian sway. It had a chequered career in its rise to power, as it was opposed bitterly by another league on the North, the Aetolian, and also by Sparta on the South. Sometimes it was allied with Macedon, as at Sellasia, but its character as a whole could not help being anti-Macedonian.

Hence we find it an ally of the Romans at the battle of Cynoscephalæ. From this event till the death of Philopoemen (197-183 B. C.) it reached its greatest extent and was at the height of its power. For a time it united the entire Peloponnesus. Its northern rival, the Aetolian league, was crushed by Rome in 189 B. C. Thus it seemed for a while to be the destined political form for nationalizing Greece. But on the whole the principle of federalism ran against the innate bent of the Greek mind with its ingrained autonomy. And the old States were not without jealousy of this young upstart which had not much culture and almost no history. Thus two political parties arose over the Achæan idea. Moreover it was not only opposed to autonomy in the strict Greek sense, but also opposed to Roman supremacy, which had for the present proclaimed and upheld autonomy. Hence a Roman party appeared in the Achæan confederacy, headed by Callicrates, whose political antagonist was Lycortas, father of Polybius the historian who himself took part in the struggle,

and who has transmitted the disparagement of his opponents to future ages. One may see however, that the Roman party had some honest and even patriotic grounds for existence. Callicrates may have been corrupt, but he could give some good reasons for his policy.

There is no doubt, however, that Rome began to assert more and more openly the mastery over Greece which she knew she possessed. The Greeks saw, in the course of the generation following the mandate of Flamininus, that their commanded autonomy was a phantom, a contradiction in terms. They could not help observing that it was played before them as a toy for amusing and deluding them during a change of supremacy from Macedon to Rome. So it came about that when a new Macedonian war broke out (the third), the patriotic or sentimental Greek had shifted to the side of Macedon as the representive of the Hellenic nationality.

The battle of Pydua (168 B.C.) completed the downfall and disruption of Macedon, which was cut up into four republics so-called. The other Hellenic enemy of Rome, the Achæan league, was also punished, but in a peculiar way: one thousand of its leading citizens of the anti-Roman party were deported to Italy and distributed through sundry Italian towns where they stayed for sixteen years (167–151 B.C.). Among these was the historian Polybius.

What can be plainer than that the Greek Peninsula, and also Asia Minor, yea the whole Macedonian empire has found its coming master, and must be getting aware of the fact? Indeed the Polyarchy of Empire-States has undone itself as completely as did the Polyarchy of City-States, through an incessant self-conflict, each warring for its own domination and against that of any other. What it sought for itself, it could not allow, much less impart, to its neighbor. Neither the City-State nor the Empire State could act universally, and hence was rent by an inner contradiction. It is true that the Achaean league did try to federate some Greek City-States under a universal law or constitution. This federal experiment rouses great interest, particularly in modern times. But it ran counter to the Greek political consciousness. Hence it succeeded but partially and temporarily with the City-State. Still the deepest problem of the time lies elsewhere — not in the City-State, which is properly past, but in the Empire-State, which is overwhelmingly present. If the Achæan league had succeeded in federating all the City-States of Greece, it would not yet have reached the heart of the age's trouble. It might have done something truly world-historical, if it had been able to federate the Empire-States of all Macedonian Hellas both in Europe and in Asia. But why ask of it any such task,

which really lies beyond Rome, indeed beyond Europe. For to-day Europe is still a Polyarchy of independent, self-conflicting States, which have as yet not been able to federate or otherwise to get rid of what may be called the Polyarchic malady. Still very suggestive and soul-stirring is that ancient attempt of the Achæan league to cure the ills of the Greek City-State, even if the remedy came too late, the patient being already quite dead and the World-Spirit having taken another way toward its end.

III. *Macedonian Hellas subordinate.* — Alexander's Successors have now their one impersonal Successor, Rome. As Macedon subordinated the City-State of Greece, so she is herself subordinated. The many Empire-States which have put down the many City-States, are in turn put down by one City-State which is or is becoming an Empire. The Greek Polyarchy, seeking to unify itself from within, has failed, and has to be unified from without.

The Macedonian or Proto-Hellenic baptism, which civilized Greece has had to pass through, is over, and a new dip of the total Greek Peninsula, barbarous and civilized, is going to take place. These two elements have remained more or less distinct, though there has been an advance toward national coalescence. At the battle of Pydna there was a strong sentiment of nationality throughout Greece, which favored

Macedon. Thirty years before at the battle of Cynoscephalæ, national feeling ran the other way, and took the side of Rome. Greece began to feel itself a Nation when it was no longer a Nation. While it was independent, it was divided and at war with itself; but when all Hellas, both civilized and barbarous, was reduced to a common subjection, it began to have a community of feeling in its common distress. Adversity united Greece, as prosperity never could; servitude begat the sense of nationality, which freedom was totally unable to do — that is, freedom of the Greek sort. After hundreds of years of training, the Greeks will once more get back their Nation.

The three political forms which Greece has evolved are all to be subordinated to the new external master. These are in historic order, the City-State, the Empire-State, and the Federal State. As we have seen in the last days of Greece, these three forms co-existed, but they could not co-operate harmoniously; each was at bottom hostile to the rest, even if two of them would unite against the third, lest it get too great. Sparta as autonomous City-State held out long and courageously against Macedon and also against the Achæan League, though each of these was the foe of the other. Such was the fresh Hellenic maelstrom starting after the death of Alexander, quite similar to that which

we saw during and after the Peloponnesian War between Athens, Sparta, and Thebes. Then the friction lay essentially within one political form, the autonomous City-State. But in Macedonian Hellas the collision arises between the political forms themselves, which we have called the City-State (as Athens, Sparta, and many others), the Empire-State (embracing the various realms of the Diadochi in Europe and Asia), and the Federal State (numerous examples in Greek History, the chief being the Achæan League). The City-State still seeks autonomy as the great political boon, though it may be monarchic, aristocratic, or democratic.

Now Rome comes upon the before-mentioned three political forms in Greece, each working counter to the other, and each seeking supremacy. It finds out, not at once but in the course of many years, that it has to subordinate all three in order to pacify and still further to associate dissociative Hellas. And it will likewise find out that all three will unite and turn against it as the common foe, and thereby attain in enmity a community of feeling for the first time in a long while. Thus Rome, in part externally and with design, and in part internally and without design, will unite separative Greece.

But while Greece is subordinated politically by Rome, it is triumphant in another field, that of culture, conquering and indeed transforming its

antagonist. Art, Poetry, Philosophy, Science in their Greek forms, go to Rome and take captive its best spirits, its intellect. Through Roman territorial conquest, Greek mind reaches out to the limits of the civilized world, in the West as well as in the East.

Rome was a long time getting acquainted with Greece. Leaving out earlier relations, we find Pyrrhus in his Italian campaign introducing the Macedonian phalanx to the Roman legion, and seeking to subject to his Empire-State the City-States of Italy and Sicily. Through Pyrrhus Rome comes to know Macedonian Hellas, whose throne he claims and for a time holds. He will try to do in the West what Alexander did in the East. He is the enemy of the City-State both in its Greek and Roman form; though king of Epirus, he really represents the Macedonian Empire-State. But he is foiled by the West, which has another and deeper world-historical principle already germinating in its bosom.

The event which brought Rome decisively into the Greek Peninsula was the treaty of the Macedonian King, Philip V., with Hannibal (216 B. C.), who was at the time in Italy not far from the gates of the Roman city. The so-called first Macedonian War broke out, whose chief object on the part of Rome was to keep Philip out of Italy — wherein it succeeded. But at the con-

clusion of peace (205 B. C.), Rome kept her hand upon several places in the Greek Peninsula and had won Greek allies. She was waiting to punish Macedon for that alliance with her mortal enemy in the hour of her greatest trial. On the other hand Philip still continued to give help to Carthage after the peace. But with the victory of Zama (202 B. C.) Rome's hands were freed, and her process with Hellas began.

(*a*) The second Macedonian War shows that Rome intends to undo the Empire-State of Macedon, and to resolve it back into the political constituents out of which it was originally put together by Philip and Alexander. The present Macedonian king (Philip V.) is completely defeated at Cynoscephalæ (197 B. C.) by the Romans under Flamininus, who the following year declares that all the Greeks, especially those hitherto subject to the king of Macedon, are free and independent. Autonomy is thus restored to Hellas, which is intended to become again what it was ere the great Philip began his work of subordinating it to his sway. The dream of the Greek patriots seems to have come true. Still it is said that Philopoemen and his Achæans looked on forebodingly, though they were allies of the Romans, for they could not help feeling that the decree of autonomy meant the disssolution of their league in the end.

But such was Rome's first political stroke in

Hellas and really against it, as the sequel proved. The divisive, Polyarchic bent of the civilized Greek is given full rein, and Macedonian Hellas is divided up into many parts, each of which is held asunder and balanced against the others by the astute outsider. Macedon is preserved in her old limits as a counterpoise to Aetolia and Epirus in the West, and to Pergamus in the East. Sparta even under its bloody tyrant Nabis is allowed to live as a check to the Achæan league. Such is the first Roman interference in Greece, whose subordination is real, even if concealed under that magical but delusive word autonomy.

(*b*) The process now is that Greece becomes aware of its delusion and turns against the cause of it, Rome. In the next thirty years all three political elements of Hellas — City-State, Empire-State and League — separate from their Roman unifier, and wish to expel him, though there is a Roman party everywhere. Macedon, aspiring to its former greatness as Empire-State, enters upon the third Macedonian War with Rome and is disastrously overcome in the battle of Pydna (168) by Aemilius Paullus, which marks a new stage in the subordination of Greece to the coming master. Macedon is divided anew into four separate districts, (called republics) each of which has its own capital city. The attempt is to break up the original Macedonian

Nation, and to reduce it to four independent City-States, whose people are not allowed to intermarry or to trade together. All the chief men not only of Macedon but of the cities of the Achæan league are deported to Italy, the design being to eliminate the leaders of the anti-Roman party from the whole land.

Greece is still suffered to have a certain degree of self-government, under its own laws, but even this must be exercised through the Greeks of the Roman party, whom the people soon began to regard as traitors and renegades to the Hellenic cause. The Macedonians, though externally divided into four parts without lawful intercommunication, still retained the memory of their common greatness and kept alive the national ambition to restore their Empire-State. The result was a fourth and even a fifth Macedonian War under two pretenders, both of whom were speedily put down by Rome. In these troubles the Achæan league also gets involved, chiefly through its returned exiles, and is dissolved by Rome into its original elements. This leads to a conflict ending in the battle of Corinth (146 B. C.), which may be deemed the Chaeroneia of Macedonian Hellas, the latter now getting back the blow which it gave to Autonomous Hellas after an historic career of about two centuries.

(*c*) The Roman master now takes his third

and final attitude toward Greece, that of open mastery, whereby the whole Greek Peninsula becomes incorporated in the Roman empire. It is divided into two Roman provinces, Macedonia and Achaea, in which names substantially the old division into barbarous and civilized Greece may be recognized, a division which Macedon had sought to obliterate. Thus Rome on this side is trying to restore old Hellas. But each province has its Roman Governor with his civil and military officials, in whom authority resides, except when it reaches back to the Central Italian city itself. As far as possible, Greece is reduced to a cluster of separate City-States whose inner constitution is also changed; there is no longer self-government, but a committee of propertied residents has control under Roman superintendance, after the pattern of Italian municipalities. Demos especially is turned out of office, Monarchos and Aristos sometimes fare a little better, but not much. Thus Greece is provincialized somewhat after the Sicilian model, which Rome has already introduced.

Three ways of undoing Macedonian Hellas Rome has practised: (1) undoing the Macedonian Empire-State after Cynoscephalæ, and reducing it to the original Nation; (2) undoing the Macedonian Nation after Pydna, and dividing it practically into four City-States; (3) undoing these Macedonian City-States, as far as

they were autonomous, after the Fourth War, and provincializing them into the Roman rule. Such is the outcome of the Macedonian Empire-State, which, as already noted, has gotten its own.

At the same time Rome has undone the City-State itself as autonomous and made it completely heteronomous within and without. One cannot help thinking that it too has received the consequence of its deed, the logic of its principle. It would not associate but sought to dominate its like, so it is dominated, now wholly from the outside. The necessary outcome of Greek Autonomy is Roman Heteronomy, which movement has likewise had its stages: The Greek City-State is governed by Rome (1) through itself, (2) then through the Romanizing Greeks, (3) finally through the Roman himself and his law.

The Leagues, the last governmental form which Greece elaborated to save herself, are dissolved by Rome into their constituent communities. Thus all three kinds of Hellenic governments — Empire-State, City-State, and Federal State — lie divided and scattered over the face of Hellas, which has thus completely realized its original separative character. The deepest, most pervasive fact of the Greek political consciousness through all its History, has borne its fruit in the complete self-undoing of the Hellenic

Nation, which now disappears in Rome — politically disappears, not culturally by any means. Thus Greece has gone through its Macedonian discipline of two centuries, and we may well ask, What does it all mean? Certainly there has been a prolonged communal training in which the small community has had to obey one great Will beyond its own, and has found out that it cannot exist by itself, but must in some way associate or be associated. So the exclusive communal idea is to be drilled out of Hellas after it has done its work for human civilization. As embodied in Greek Art, Literature, Science, Philosophy (for all these were communal in origin), it will be preserved ideally and in that way passed through all cultured minds hereafter. It shows in brief epitome the meaning and limits of man's association in the Community (or City-State.) But there is now to rise a new and higher principle of association, and the Macedonian supremacy may be deemed the breaking of the Greek communal Will to something above itself. In this period we find, accordingly, a negative, terrible, often hopeless feeling—especially in the never-ending see-saw of war between the Diadochi. Macedon fails at last to unify Greece, and the task is transferred to the Romans. Nor should we forget that the long Roman discipline now impending over Greece is really a preparation for its nationality, for the second or Byzantine Hellas.

It is noteworthy that Macedon during this period could no longer produce Great Men capable of realizing its national idea. It seems to have quite exhausted itself in bringing forth Philip and Alexander. The Syrian Monarch Antiochus indeed called himself the Great, but he was hardly more than a caricature on Alexander the Great, whom he would imitate. Hence it came that Macedonian Hellas on all sides kept falling back into the Greek Polyarchy. No great Man arose who could realize the Folk-Soul of Macedon, which thus failed to unify Asia and to unify Greece; still less could it unify Asia and Greece together—the consumation of Alexander's work. These three unifications however, we shall see accomplished by Rome, which brings a new power of political association into the world, a power clearly not possessed by Hellas in any of its historic stages.

Briefly we may here recall these stages—the three Hellases they can be regarded—the Early (Proto-Hellenic), the Autonomous, and the Macedonian. We have traced each of them fulfilling its historic round, which itself becomes a part of a still greater round of History, till we behold for instance the total Hellenic cycle. But now we are to see this in turn as a part or stage of a yet vaster process which next calls forth Rome in the movement of the World's, History toward its supreme end, the State universal.

2. *ROME.*

The History of Rome has the same political form underlying it as the History of Greece, namely, the City-State. This is the common element, the connecting link which holds together all classic antiquity. Greek, Roman, and finally Byzantine government was that of the City-State; a single community claimed and maintained an all-sufficient authority over itself, both as to external and internal relations. The City-State, however, separates into different kinds of itself, one of which is the Roman, in contrast to the Hellenic.

Already the Hellenic City-State has been set forth quite fully with its dominating principle of autonomy. It was, accordingly, separative, dissociative; Hellas never did and never could unite

itself into a political whole and become one organized Nation. In this regard Rome is quite the opposite: it associates the different communities, tribes, nations into a single political totality. Such is its deepest bent, its inevitable character, indeed its world-historical function. Rome we may, therefore, call associative in contrast to dissociative, autonomous Greece; in its historic career we shall behold it associating first itself, then Italy, and finally the Mediterranean world.

Such is Rome in its essence. But we must here enforce that this tendency is not simply Roman, a civic peculiarity of hers and nothing more. In such case it would have little interest for us now, indeed it would have long since vanished with its community. We must grasp the fact that this associative character is the next great stage after Hellas in the movement of the World's History. Rome becomes filled with an end beyond its immediate own; it gets to bear the stamp of the World-Spirit. Hardly for its own sake merely do we study ancient Rome to-day, but because it, as associative, is world-historical.

To be sure her method of association was external, largely that of violence and war, and cannot be approved by the man of to-day, who applies his modern consciousness to ancient problems. She insisted upon being the associative

city alone, upon having a monopoly of association, quite to the exclusion of other cities and nations. For instance, she took away from Latin towns the right of making a league among themselves, as they had previously done; they were to be associated through her only—she being the one central associative power for all. The right of independent association was what she could not tolerate, even in allies and in federated states. The communal unit she often left to govern itself within, but it must not dare treat with other communal units like itself, except through her. Even intermarriage and intercommercial dealings (*connubium et commercium*) were often prohibited.

Thus Rome became jealous of all intercommunal ties and relations as hostile to her deepest purpose and character, yea as subversive of her very destiny. She must be the associative city exclusively, in fact the tyrant of association, and cannot stop till the world she associates in her way. Such was her strength, but likewise her limit, upon which she breaks and becomes tragic. Indeed we may say that such was her primal right of existence, her great historic duty, which finally becomes her supreme wrong and sends her to her doom. We are to see the vast services which Rome rendered to the communities and nations which she associated; really she first civilized the world as a whole, or

at least the Mediterranean world. The isolated town, tribe, people had to be associated externally, ere they could receive the civilization of the totality, and become also self-associating. Let it not be forgotten, then, that Rome in her one-sideness is fulfillirg a world-historical destiny, and in that has her justification. With untold labor and no small ability she toils at her task, till it is accomplished. This does mean that we are morally to defend everything that she did. That is quite impossible; but we are to see her carrying out the behest of the World-Spirit for her time and stage of development.

Much use, therefore, we shall make of the term *Association* in setting forth the significance of Roman History, in which it occupies the same place that the term *Autonomy* does in Greek History. Of course we are now treating of what is usually called the Roman republic, which, however, starts as a kingdom and ends as an empire.

I. Rome associative universally finds its chief spiritual instrument as well as its expression in Law. The one City-State, associating permanently all City-States and communities makes its command universal and thus is supremely legislative. Herein again is a strong contrast with Greece. Each Greek community made its own law in its way, and regarded such power as the very essence of its freedom; this was its auton-

omy, which, however, Rome is to do away with. The result was that Greece had as many laws as cities; a man passing from one city to another had no law for himself, was really an outlaw. Greece was, therefore, *polynomous* while Rome became *mononomous*, and finally reduced the world to one Law. This springs from its associative spirit already designated; it will unite all through itself, it makes the law, which is thus the law of Association. Already in the beginning it combined its three constituent peoples under law, and had to be legal.

The State as such is to secure Free-Will through the Law. The Roman State was to secure universal Free-Will, that of all civilized peoples, through its universal Law, which was to govern them all. The Civil Law arose through Rome for civilization. The Greek City-State also secured Free-Will through the law, but that of itself, of its own citizens, not that of another community, which to the Greek mind had to be autonomous. Hence its Law was communal, not universal, being unable to protect inter-communal relations, which are what Rome has seized upon and associated with and through itself.

We are, then, to see that the associative, mononomous City-State of Rome is a great historic advance upon the dissociative, polynomous City-State of Hellas. A decided step it is to-

ward man's freedom actualized in the State universal, which is the goal of History. Still it has its limitation, yea its inner self-contradiction, which will in time work itself out in decay and destruction. Rome, as already said, keeps association for herself, but denies it to other communities. Thus she really denies her own principle in its universality, and assails her own vital germ. Her good is not good for others; what she deems bad for herself, she forces upon her neighbor. But what I destroy in another, I destroy ultimately in myself. Rome's associative character thus has its negative side, which will unfailingly be brought home to her, even by those whom she has associated, or rather has refused to associate universally, on an equality with herself. Italy, the Provinces, the World will come back, and demand her right as theirs also, and will proceed to put her down as she has put them down, thereby associating her, too, with themselves, as she once associated them with herself. But this final act has to be done by the Strong Man outside of the City-State, and in him the Roman Republic ends, having passed over into the Empire.

So Rome legalizes the world, making the Law universal over many heterogeneous peoples. The Law becomes its associative instrument, backed of course by its armies, which compelled nations to receive Law, and thus to be joined together

in a common justice. How often Rome fell short of this its ideal, its history sternly shows; still we are not to forget the principle, though frequently obscured and violated in conduct.

II. Italy, in which Rome is situated, and which was its first large large task in association, is the second or middle peninsula of North-Mediterranean Europe. This geographical position corresponds to its historical place in the entire sweep of the ancient world. The so-called Roman Republic is second or intermediate between Hellas and the Empire. Moreover, these three stages form a process (or the Psychosis) of antiquity as a whole.

While Italy is thus a peninsula, it does not break up into many peninsulas like Greece, though it has a number of them. Its coast line, in proportion to its territory, is accordingly much less than that of its eastern sister. On the one hand its peninsular character corresponds to that of Europe as a totality, which is also a peninsula. On the other hand it distinctly diverges from the peninsular divisions and subdivisions which bring so much separation physically into Hellas, and become Nature's basis for the separative character of it spiritually, and in particular for its dissociative political institutions. Here, then, we may draw our first contrast between Italy and Greece.

Connected with the Italic peninsula are com-

paratively few islands. Sicily, the largest, is ethnically and historically a part of it, being separated from the mainland only by a narrow ditch. Corsica and Sardinia lie to one side at a considerable distance. Italy has no islanded Aegean dividing her massive territory on the one hand and on the other connecting her with the East or West. By nature she is essentially one, unified, and will be the seat of political unification, not only of herself but of the Mediterranean world.

Italy, however, has its physical divisions, which are through mountains, rather than through the sea. The result is, its parts are everywhere accessible on foot, and will call forth the soldier more than the sailor. The ancient Italians seem to have had a kind of aversion to the sea: with good reason, for the sea literally turns away from them, compared with Hellas which it actually caresses in a hundred little ways. Look at the Italian line of the Adriatic, of old called inhospitable; land and and water there seem mutually repellent. It was down this coast that the Sabellians migrated, who shunned the sea and its nautical life; the colonizing Greek also avoided it, planting his cities further to the South.

Toward the West, however, land and sea became more friendly to each other, and a maritime intercourse began. The central mountains

shade off toward the sea into rich plains which are traversed by running streams, one of which, the Tiber, has a great name in History. Thus Italy may be said to turn her back upon the Hellenic peninsula, and to cast her favoring glances westward. Rome decisively separates from Greece, both in Nature and in the World's History. On this western coast an Italic people, the Etruscan, will become seafaring at an early time, and begin to connect separated, self-occupied Italy with the civilized nations of antiquity. It is probable that regal Rome through the Etruscan navigator first received some drops of influence from the World's History.

Italy, then, is a peninsula, like Greece, but a peninsula which holds itself together, refusing to peninsularize itself into multitudinous lesser forms of itself. Nor will it permit the sea to intermingle freely with its land and cut up its parts into adjacent islands. So the Roman City-State will remain the one City-State, not reproducing itself in other independent City-States like itself as colonies (as did Greece), nor even permitting other already existent communities to remain separate and autonomous. Thus institutional Rome accords with its physical environment, though it is not said that Nature made the Roman City-State. If that were the case, it ought perchance to still be there.

Nature may be deemed to furnish a kind of mould or matrix for the institutions of a people at a given time, when they are ready to be moulded. But the artificer is a different power.

Such, then, is the physical character of Italy with its tendency toward unity. But when we look from Nature to Man, the scene changes. The peninsula opens its History with a great diversity of tribes, peoples, cities. Some of these cities in Etruria and still more in Latium, were trying to get together in leagues with various degrees of cohesion. Among this much-divided mass of humanity and institutions, the Roman City-State appears with its arduous task of association lasting centuries. On the Whole it is favored by Nature for its special historic work, and the same thing we have already remarked concerning Hellas.

Another significant fact about physical Italy should be noted: its reclining position. From North-West to South-East it leans at an angle averaging forty-five degrees. Which way is it leaning or seeking to move? Looking at its famous foot or boot, we observe that it seems to be marching westward even in the South. Then Northern Italy bends strongly toward Gaul and perchance Spain, both of which were largely inhabited by Celts, as was also the valley of the Po. On the other hand Southern Italy with Sicily is nearer Greece, from which it received

at an early time numerous colonies. Between these two extremes, which we may call Celtic and Hellenic, or barbarous and civilized, lay Central Italy, with Rome at its heart, which is to be the associating or mediating power of the two extremes. The situation of Rome suggests its world-historical function.

We may recall that Italy is the middle peninsula of the three belonging to the North-Mediterranean territory, and has by its location at least the opportunity to be the mediator, the unifier, the associator. We shall see that Roman History moves forward in Time with a physical correspondence in Space, embracing first central Italy, then total Italy, then the Western (Iberian) and the Eastern (Hellenic) peninsulas, and finally the tri-continental Mediterranean world. Such we may consider the grand mediatorial act of Rome as political. Even Greek learning has reached and still reaches the West largely through Rome's speech. Greece of herself does not come this way, she has to be mediated for us through the Latin at the start. The boot of Southern Italy indicates the stride out of the East to the West, and perchance across to Africa, since it tips strongly southward as if to step on Sicily, and then pass over. And this is what Rome did historically when she had united Italy: she passed to Africa from Sicily. Let it be added that

medieval Rome still maintained the mediatorial character, not as political however, but as religious, associating the European world through the explicit doctrine of the Mediator. Heathen Rome also had somewhat of the same character, though in a secular way.

Physical Italy, therefore, is compact of territory compared to physical Greece, which is insular and peninsular. Spain, the third peninsula, with its square and enclosed shape is still more concentrated by nature than Italy, which though connected, is much elongated in form. This physical gradation of the three North-Mediterranean peninsulas has had its counterpart in their historic careers.

Here we should not fail to note the contrasting fact: Italy though physically more united than Greece, was spiritually more deeply separated at the dawn of History, before its association through Rome, whose primal problem indeed was furnished by this Italic separation. The peoples lying nearest to Rome—Latin, Sabellian, Etruscan—were ethnically different and hostile to one another; still more deeply separated from them and from each other were the Celts in the North and the Greeks in the South. Everywhere in Italy was also communal separation. In Greece, on the contrary, there was essentially one racial stock (the Hellenic), one religion, one language. Italy had no com-

mon festivals like the Olympic, no common book or bible, like the Homeric poems, no common enterprise lying back of her historic life, like the Trojan or Persian Wars. A Pan-Italic feeling, corresponding to the Pan-Hellenic, was not existent till it was created by Rome when she had associated Italy. Greece as ethnic and elemental had unity, though it passed into the separative City-State when it became civilized. But Italy was ethnically separative as well as communally, till it was unified by Rome, of whose task and of whose training we begin to catch a glimpse.

Such is in general, the ethnic diversity of Italy, furnishing the raw material of Rome's Association. But ere we go further, it will be in place to look back into the source of this diversity of Italic peoples.

III. Into the Italic peninsula as into the Hellenic, rolled successive waves of peoples at diverse periods, of which an exact History, measured by years or even by centuries, cannot be given. Indeed the order of their succession is often doubtful. But linguistic remains have been transmitted in sufficient quantity that Comparative Philology can ascertain the chief layers of this inflowing mass of peoples. What we have called the Ethnic Protoplasm (p. 36) may thus get its first organization in Italy as the pre-historic substrate of History.

Here we come upon the fact that all these previous layers of migrating humanity were doubtless Aryans; that is, they had come originally from a central home somewhere in Middle Asia, sweeping westward in various successive streams, which again had shot off into several branches as they approached their goal.

It is known that there was a pre-Aryan race scattered over the greater part of Europe, whose existence is attested, not by language, but by considerable remains, such as stone-implements, kitchen-middens, and lake dwellings on piles. Living remnants of this earlier Proto-European people, driven into remote corners by their racial conquerors, are supposed to be seen in the Lapps and Finns and possibly in the Basques, whose speech has been compared with the Aryan and declared to have different roots and laws. Here, however, it need only be said that Italy is remarkably devoid of any such pre-historic relics; its monuments and its languages in all their diversity point to a common Aryan relationship, which, however, reaches back very far, even to that people dwelling in classic twilight, the so-called Pelasgians. These may be deemed the first Aryan layer spread over both Greece and Italy, and preserved in spots till historic times. The Iapygians in the heel of Italy and the Siculi were probably of this

earliest Aryan layer, which is essentially unhistoric.

Passing to the historic Aryans of Italy, we find in them diversity enough, and consequent conflict. Indeed, it may be said that the Italic peoples are distinguished for their divergences, for their heterogeneity. Compared with them, the Hellenic peoples are homogeneous — of one nationality, though of different tribes like Ionic and Doric. But the Italians are split up into several nations, which still further are divided into tribes and states. Now it is upon these national and ethnic differences that the History of Rome primarily turns; hence the student must first of all put them into some kind of order.

(1) We may first look at the Sabellian stock, quite the largest, most diversified and most widely scattered of Italic peoples. It was also the first probably of the Aryan migrations after the Pelasgians, and extended quite from the valley of the Po down the Appenines and eastern coast to the Bruttians. These Sabellians — such is the general name which (with Niebuhr) we shall apply to them—were mostly mountaineers, had little or no political unity, and on the whole were decidedly opposed to that of Rome. In fact the Sammites, a Sabellian people, were the most determined and desperate foes that Rome ever had anywhere, and more

than once made her look destruction in the face. Yet a Sabellian element we shall see entering into the original organization of the Roman City-State, even under Romulus, for the Sabines were a Sabellian tribe, which, lying nearest to the young community, was soon associated with it.

(2) The Latin stock should be next mentioned, with its cluster of cities chiefly situated in the plain of Latium. In some pre-historic time it separated from the Sabellians; where or when cannot be told. It has been supposed also to have mingled with older nations. The historic age finds the bifurcation complete; the one branch, Sabellian, is of the Highland, the other is of the Lowland (Latium, Flatland) and calls itself Lowlander (Latinus); its speech bears the same name, being that of the flat country (like Platt-Deutsch in contrast with Hoch-Deutsch; in fact to speak Platt is to speak Latin, both words being of the same old Aryan root). This dialect of the Lowland is destined to a great future, supplanting other Italic dialects and becoming the language of Roman civilization, and also for a long period the literary vehicle of the Latin Church. At present we have only to add that Latium is to furnish the leading element of the new city.

(3) The Estruscans are the third Italic people who give a primordial ingredient to the making

of Rome. Their mystery has never been solved by modern scholarship, though their language, their art, their works of various kinds still exist in considerable quantity. Several indications, however, point to their Aryan origin, though their racial separation from the mother stem must have been at a time long before that of the Latin and Greek stocks, which show their close linguistic kinship in many forms. Nor is it known when or by what way the Etruscans came into Italy. Their first Italian habitation seems to have been in the Valley of the Po, into which they probably passed over the Rhætian Alps, as Rhætia is said to have spoken Etruscan still in later Roman times.

The important fact for our present theme is that we now have before us the elemental ethnic constituents which go to form original Rome. These are the Latin, Sabellian and Etruscan, of which each has its own distinct character as a people, and undoubtedly contributes the same to the new Roman compound. Whereof more is to be said later.

Two other stocks, which we may call non-Italic, were appearing in Italy about the time of the early kings of Rome —the Celt in the North and the Greek in the South, the barbarous and the civilized, the land-farer and the sea-farer. The Celts poured over the Alps in a vast tribal migration, bringing along as their basic institu-

tion the simple Village Community; the Greeks came as colonists, settling on or near the sea-coast for the purpose of trade and intercommunication, bearing with them their peculiar institution, the City-State, which was already developed with its principle of autonomy. The destiny of the Celt is to be Romanized, but the destiny of the Greek is to Hellenize through culture and civilization the Roman, who, however, will show the ability to associate both the barbarian and the civilized man in a common political institution.

IV. When Rome impinges upon the Greek City-State of Southern Italy, she grapples directly with her chief world-historical problem, which is to associate just that autonomous, self-sufficing Greek City-State in a new political norm, which is her own. Can she do it? That is what her History must show. Particularly in the war with Pyrrhus, the two sides, the Roman and the Greek, are aligned openly against each other in bitter conflict. This is the conflict between an incoming and an outgoing political order; Rome is brought face to face with her world-historical predecessor in the Greek City-State, which will not fail to fight for its continued existence. We must recollect that both are fundamentally City-States, but of a different character; the one is associative, the other dissociative, so that the problem runs,

Can Rome associate her dissociative counterpart? We shall see that this problem winds through Ancient History to its end.

There was a time when the Hellenic and Italic peoples were all one, speaking one tongue, having the same grade of institutions, with one religion and one ethnic character. Then they bifurcate somewhere on the way to their future peninsular abodes, and become different in religion, institutions and character. To draw the distinction between the typical Greek and Roman without obliterating their similarity, has always been seen to be a pivotal task of the historian of antiquity. The one unfolded the individual in and through his community, the other subordinated the individual to his community. In Rome the citizen has his supreme end outside of himself, he is to be made useful to his institution, serving it with unremitting labor, and literally devoting his life to its existence. The Greek also showed devotion to his City-State, but rather as the means for his own full, free development, than as an end in itself. Beauty he sought, individualized as it must be in one way or other; the Roman's category was chiefly utility, which he remorsely applied to himself. Hence he had a gospel of work, while the Greek loved enjoyment and often luxuriated in idleness, like the happy Faun of Praxiteles. The modern Italian, more Hellenic than Roman,

has a good deal of the same temperament in his *dolce far niente*. The easy-going Greek would keep his own law and let everybody else do the same; the stern Roman had as his mighty task to legalize the world, putting it under one law, namely his own. He has to associate the autonomous state and the autonomous man, that is, the Greek; hence he primarily gives up his own autonomy to his City-State, which is to subordinate autonomy. The Roman was a stoic long before Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, was born; hence the true Roman naturally took to the Stoical philosophy and therein became conscious of his own character. The dualism inherent in the thought of the Stoa was profoundly Roman: The Self must put down the Self in order to be, its end must be negative to itself as end.

We may also see now that Rome is essentially abstract, turning away from individuality, while Hellas is concrete, cherishing and even idealizing individuality. So it comes that the Greek City-State will beget Art, Poetry, History, Science, yea Philosophy also, which is of these two kinds, concrete and abstract, or Greek and Roman. In a sense Rome is universal, is turned to the One, namely to Rome herself, which politically brings all the world into unity, not through itself but through herself. Not the Universe, but Rome is universal for Rome,

which is her own word and is full of her meaning. Subtly different is the corresponding Greek word: *katholon*, for all or the whole. Religion even binds *back* or *again* the Roman man to his City-State, which is also its end (though this derivation of it from *ligo* to bind, is contested). Thus Religion for Rome is a political means.

As to Intellect, therefore, and all its products, the Romans must be deemed an abstract people; but when it comes to Will they are exceedingly concrete. Their Deed has, accordingly, an infinitely higher place than their thought, in the World's History. Really the Roman has no time for thinking, he is too busy. Like the man of affairs, to-day, he considers the artist, poet, philosopher rather as a trifler, who is certainly not to be compared with a practical person like himself. His spiritual movement is outward, not inward—toward associating the world under one City-State, not toward formulating it under one principle.

And yet Rome and the Roman will change, evolving into something like their opposites. The Great Man of Rome, after subordinating himself so completely to his City-State and its end, will at last come to subordinate his City-State to himself and his end. There is no denying that the Roman Republic evolved Julius Cæsar, who brought it to a conclusion, yea to

his own conclusion. Rome's suppression of the individual ultimately begat the most colossal individual for suppressing the suppressor, Rome. At the same time with the rise of the Great Individual, the Roman mind began to bloom in Poetry, History, and Philosophy. The old fetters were broken and a new order set in, of which Literature became the expression. Greek Spirit, being assimilated by Rome, undoubtedly contributed to the foregoing result. The Roman individual at last broke loose, and expressed himself, but that bloom of literature indicated in its deepest note the end of Rome as a Republic. He became Hellenic rather than Roman, and re-echoed, to be sure in his own manner, the former utterance of the Greek individual, who, however, was original and spontaneous.

In kinship the Greeks were more closely united together than the Italians, they were more homogeneous, as already said. This feeling of unity they never lost through Roman domination; hence it comes that Constantine, after their discipline of four centuries, could make them a nation politically, which they had hardly been before, not even under the Macedonian, who swayed them from the outside and in parts. On the other hand when the Roman grip began to relax, Italy again fell to pieces ethnically, or was easily knocked to pieces by the barbarian, and returned essentially to the

disunited condition in which Rome found her at the start. Thus with the Empire Hellas and Italy will change parts politically; the Greek will learn and apply Rome's lesson of association, and the Roman will assume the Greek dissociative character. But this is a chapter which lies beyond Rome as a Republic.

V. Rome after unifying Italy and Hellas will turn to the Orient and associate it with herself in the one City-State seeking to be universal. Particularly her Great Men who begin to subordinate her end to their own — Sulla, Pompey, Cæsar — will go to West-Asia and there have remarkable careers, as if finding in the East with its absolutism not only food for their autocratic dispositions, but also a training for Rome to the new imperial order under which she is to be transformed. Thus the Roman City-State in its last period turns back to the Orient, as did Hellas under Alexander, and rounds out the cycle of its History as a Republic in becoming imperialized, if not Orientalized.

It may be said, accordingly, that Rome also seeks to overcome the grand separation between Europe and the Orient, which we have seen attempted by both Persia and Greece. The racial cleavage between the Eastern and Western branches of the one great Aryan family produced the historic consciousness, and has given the main periods to History. But Rome never

penetrated to the old Aryan home like Alexander. The valley of the Euphrates remained the Roman boundary, the Oriental Rim, beyond which Rome seemed unable to pass. The great Romans, after their Oriental conquests seemed always to be drawn back to their Rome, the center of the world. This center with its associative power is what they would ultimately possess. Not so Alexander, who found his center in the Orient. Cæsar, with whom he is always coupled, was compelled after the battle of Zela (famed for calling forth his brief epistle *veni*, *vidi*, *vici*,) to turn back and establish the Empire, his world-historical task. Still Cæsar may have had some lurking Aryan presentiment like that of Alexander. We read that he intended to start for the East with the design of subduing the Parthians, which would probably have led him to Bactria and the Indus, whither the pursuit of the Persians lured Alexander. So we may infer considering his conquest of Gaul. Moreover, Cæsar must have known well and pondered often the Oriental campaign of Alexander, which took place nearly three hundred years before his time and was preserved in an extensive literature. Probable is it that he may have felt some rivalry with the Macedonian conqueror, and would re-enact his deed, but in a larger Roman way. Certainly his Parthian expedition would have brought him directly upon Alexander's track and work,

and have compelled the comparison between himself and his mighty predecessor. But the daggers of his assassins prevented the fulfilment of his Oriental plan, and the realization of what possibly may have been the secret dream of his life—the inclusion of Alexander's empire in his own.

So we may be permitted to complete in imagination the last plan of Cæsar, whereby he would overcome the dualism between Asia and Europe, and associate the Orient with Rome as imperial. The voice of the people in all ages has coupled the names of Alexander and Cæsar as men of kindred genius with the same great end ultimately. As we construe it, that end was to bridge the deepest historic chasm of their race, and to unite the ever-conflicting halves into a governmental unity.

That Cæsar often ruminated upon the career of Alexander and read books about him, and was influenced by his example, is attested by an anecdote of Plutarch: "When Cæsar was in Spain, having some leisure on his hands, he read works written about Alexander. He was observed to be occupied with himself for a long time, and then to shed tears. To his friends wondering what could be the cause, he said: 'Does it not seem to you worthy of sorrow that Alexander when so young should have ruled so many kingdoms, while nothing glorious has yet been done

by me?' " (Life of Cæsar, c. 11.) This precious bit gives a glimpse into the soul of Cæsar, before he had conquered Gaul or won military laurels, though he was already forty years old.

Still Rome without Cæsar associated West-Asia, or the most of it, and retained it for hundreds of years, though with a fluctuating boundary. But she never penetrated to her primitive Aryan home, as did Alexander; thus she never reached the seat of the original separation of her race in Middle Asia. To do this final racial act doubtless required a Cæsar. But Rome hugged the Mediterranean with her History, never being able to cut loose from the same to any great extent, even if she reached the Atlantic in the West and took Britain. Just this last was the work of Cæsar, who therein showed himself Rome-transcending, capable of reaching beyond the Mediterranean limit and moulding the future of Western Europe. Possibly he would have done a similar deed in the Orient.

It is well to note here that Cæsar could recognize Rome's limit, and perchance his own. He seemed to feel that Rome could assimilate the Celtic, but not the Teutonic branch of the Aryan race. On this line he draws his Rim, in general coinciding with the Rhine. How true was his forecast! It is that Teutonic branch which, after being held at bay for hundreds of years, will finally break down the Rim and deluge old

Rome, who thus will be baptized anew and rejuvenated in the original Ethnic Protoplasm of her race.

VI. The Roman was a political animal (to use the expression of Aristotle), if there ever was one; the outcome was that the animal had to be fed by the State, having quit all other kinds of work in the economic field. The populace was an integral part of the government and insisted upon its reward for ruling the world. Rome was more political than Athens, whose history is not deficient on this side; but the Athenians showed that they had also other ends beside or even beyond the political. Hence the interest of Roman History is likewise unified, being concentrated upon the one point mainly. It is specially important, therefore, to look at the original germ out of which every form of government seems to spring, and which we have already noticed in the Village Community, the primordial cell of human association (see preceding pp. 48–52).

The first political process which can be detected in the embryo of the State is that between Demos, Aristos, and Monarchos, often designated numerically as the Many, the Few, the One. Either of these members may become the dominant element of government, and then we behold those political forms already ob-

served and named by the old Greeks—democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy. The student should note, however, that they properly belong together, and form co-odinately one process, which ultimately is psychical, whereby it receives its final confirmation for thought. That is, the three are stages of the Psychosis, which therein unfolds into its political manifestation. The Demos is the potential, implicit, undeveloped element, yet the possibility of all development, the original protoplasmic material; Aristos is the elect or separate Few, distinguished from the Demos by the possession of talent, wealth, birth, and putting chief stress upon the distinction; Monarchos is called the one-man power, but is properly the all-men power embodied and concentrated in the one man, thus being the return and resumption of the Demos. For Monarchos would be simply alone and unendowed without his fulfilment in the Demos. Hence comes that close relationship between democracy and the despot so often noticed in History. But now the emphatic point is to note the triple process whose manifestation is here political, but which is ultimately psychical, being grasped by Ego as a form of the Ego, and thus reaching its final identification as thought for thought.

Roman History is a movement, an interaction, a struggle between these elemental constituents of

political association—Demos, Aristos, Monarchos. At first we shall have all three in a seeming equality; then Monarchos under the name of king will be driven out, and kept out as king, though he has to appear under other titles, for he belongs to the essential process of government itself. Demos will likewise find himself subordinate to Aristos, but will keep up a desperate struggle for equality and get it with something more. Finally after centuries of suppression or at least concealment, Monarchos will again appear openly in the process, in fact dominating it and holding his power by a life-tenure. Thus Rome returns to its beginning and rounds out its cycle of republican History.

At the same time it must not be forgotten that this republican cycle, complete in itself as Roman, is but a stage or phase of the still larger cycle embracing all ancient History. This stage we call the second or separative. The thoughtful reader will ask at this point: But how does this separative character compare with Rome as associative, as uniting the world in one government? We must recall the nature of Roman association, which first separated all other governmental forms from its own and then subordinated them as different. They were not united with Rome on an equality, but as inferior, So there was the distinction between the commanding and the obedient, between the associa-

ting and the associated, between the lord and the subject.

It is true that the course of Rome's development will show this distinction assailed and finally overcome. The associated element is not to remain passive, but will become actively associating; the World, having received Rome's gift, will bring it back to her finally and associate her in her turn after her fashion. But when the dualism is completely overcome, the second stage is passed, the Republic is transcended, and a new order which is the third stage of the ancient world sets in (see preceding pp. 185–7, for the divisions of Ancient History).

Rome, therefore, as republican City-State asserts her difference, her separation from all her associated states and nations. Moreover, she shows the tendency to associate each of them in a different way from the rest; such indeed was the famous policy of Rome, which has been so much praised: she gave to some communities and peoples the full franchise, to others a partial citizenship, to others their inner self-government only, to others mere existence without rights, while still others she destroyed utterly, like Carthage. Thus they had almost no common ground upon which they could unite against her, being held to her by such different ties. Hostility to all Roman association, which was the key-note of Hannibal, meant the relapse

to former separative barbarism, which was not an agreeable prospect to many of the Italic towns, so that they clung to Rome in the hour of her supreme trial.

It is well to observe that what we here call the Roman Republic lies between two monarchies, the old kingship and the new empire. Rome passes from one kind of Monarchos to another, but while doing it, or rather in order to do it she has to conquer the world, putting her Rim of territory around the Mediterranean. Still we have to call Rome a republic from the city's beginning (754) till the empire is reaffirmed by the battle of Actium (31 B. C.)

We are to see, therefore, that Rome even in her associative character, is deeply separative, distinguishing herself in the strongest manner from those cities and nations which she associates. Thus while on the one hand she overcomes outside separation in the form of autonomy, on the other hand she affirms it within, making it the principle of her association, and taking it up into herself. With this inner separation runs an outer one, to which we have already alluded often, namely, the Rim which divides her from the extra-Roman world. These points we have to emphasize repeatedly, since they keep before the mind the place of Rome in the total sweep of Ancient History.

In this connection we may add a few words

more upon that germinal process of all political government, which we have named Demos, Aristos, and Monarchos. Properly this is the Constitution of all Constitutions, the one process underlying the infinite diversity of States. But there is distinctly a Roman embodiment of this process which we call the Roman Constitution. Hence we say that the Roman Constitution was changed fundamentally when Monarchos was driven out by the republican revolution, or when he was brought in again by the imperial revolution. When the great men of Rome would disregard the Assembly of the People (as Sulla did) or the Senate (as Caesar did), they were acting unconstitutionally. This is a different thing from an illegal act, which is done in defiance of some law made by the constitutional process. Writers on Roman History often confuse us by not discriminating between the organic and the enacted law, or between what is constitutional and what is merely legal. The Constitution of Rome is such by virtue of its being a manifestation of the one ultimate Constitution, which takes on a multitude of forms, among others the Roman. Using initials for brevity we can formulate the foregoing in this way: D. A. M, (Demos, Aristos, Monarchos) embodies itself in S. P. Q. R. (Senatus Populesque Romanus), the abbreviation of the Roman Republic.

The transition from Greece to Rome we may grasp also as that of two different kinds of association. The Greek City-State associated individual men into a communal whole which civilized him, but left the Greek nation divided into a multiplicity of these autonomous, conflicting City-States. Then Rome appears upon the scene of the World's History and associates these separated, mutually repellent City-States into one universal City-State with its one law. This is of course a new kind of association, which unites by taking away the principle of association in other City-States. Thus the inner Roman dualism already indicated arises. The Greek City-State might and did often attack her neighbor, depriving the latter of autonomy; but this was regarded as a violation of the common Hellenic consciousness. The Roman, on the contrary, doing the same deed, was strictly carrying out the political consciousness of his City-State. The problem of the Roman community was to assert itself as universal, as the one over all communities. The problem of the Greek community was to assert itself as particular, as one among many communities, each of which stood on its own basis. Rome could make the man a citizen not only of Rome but at last of the world; Greece could not make even the Greek a citizen of Greece, but only of some Greek community. So Hellas and its people have to be put through the

discipline of Rome in order to break up this communal narrowness, and to become citizens of their own country, and finally of the world. It was under Roman domination that the Greeks were trained at last to be a nation politically, and to organize the same into a State in the Byzantine empire, which long outlasted Rome herself.

Equally over dissociative Greece and associative Rome a Judgment is suspended which decrees their fall. Both undo themselves from within, yet both are doomed from without by a World-Judge before whose tribunal they appear, having run their course. Thus they become elements or stages of a process greater than themselves, which we are now trying to grasp and formulate, namely the process of the World's History.

VII. The periodicity of Roman History is its right organization. Thus we transform it from a chaotic mass of details into an ordered whole. The Republic in itself has been always considered an entirety; but what are the organic parts of its History? These we seek to get by periodizing it, by finding the periods which form the process of its events in Time.

We have used in order to designate Rome fundamentally, the category *association*. This we prefer to the more common term *conquest*, which is vague and often misleading. The History of

the Republic we can see to fall into three chief stages of the one total process of association: Rome first associates herself, secondly she associates the World with herself, thirdly the World associates her with itself. The complete process of Rome is now explicit: Rome continues to associate the world, and the world continues to associate Rome, which is the new self-association of Rome wrought by her Great Man, Julius Caesar, and producing a new form of Government, the Empire. Thus Rome in the line of association goes back to its beginning.

We must also note that Rome, in the matter of adding Monarchos to her two other constitutional elements, Aristos and Demos, has returned to her regal time, even if the name of king is avoided. The new Romulus thus interlinks with the old.

Moreover, the circummarine movement of the Roman Republic around the Mediterranean completes itself, mainly by the addition of Egypt. The great Midland Sea is indeed the chief means of associating the lands adjacent to it, and of keeping them together. Rome was not naturally a sailor, but she employed the Greek who was, and destroyed the Carthagenian, her nautical rival. Another enemy disputed her sea-power, the pirate, whom she put down with a good deal of difficulty.

Thus we see Roman History composed of

three interrelated rings or cycles: the outer territorial (circummarine), the inner governmental (from Monarch to Monarch), and the associative (uniting the governmental and the territorial). Manifestly all these belong together in the one totality of Roman History, and cannot be left out of their true place in its exposition.

It is evident, however, that the associative principle is the fundamental and organizing one, whose three stages we may briefly formulate as (1) Rome's self-association, (2) Rome's association of the World, (3) the World's association of Rome. These three thoughts, so essential to the comprehension of Roman History, we shall expound a little more fully, before passing to their application to her historic events,

(I) *Rome associates herself.* So we would name the first grand division of Roman History, namely as the republican. This self-association of Rome must be regarded in its wide sense, being an association of all the native original elements which went together to make Rome—class, community, and people. The germinal Roman association becomes Italic and national; it unites first its cognate peoples—Latin, Sabellian, Etruscan.

This must be regarded as the training period of Rome, it is disciplined to its work of association till this becomes its character. Before it can associate the world, it must associate itself; before it can unify foreign elements, it

has to unify its own. Thus, too, it gets its world-historical function: to be a City-State which overcomes the separative tendency of the City-State (Greek) of the Tribe (Barbarian) and of the Nation (Italic).

The time employed by Rome in the present period of her development is far longer than the other two periods taken together (from 754 to 281 B. C.). We shall see that it also has its own process, whose three stages may be formulated as the communal, civic, and ethnic, each of which will receive explication in its proper place.

(II.) *Rome associates the World.* That is, the Mediterranean World, which is its territory. Rome now moves beyond its original Italic kinship, and associates non-Italic, non-cognate peoples, though these be Aryan largely still. Moreover these peoples differ from Rome in civilization, some having more (Greek) and some having less (Celt). Most distinctively Rome in the present period strikes upon the Greek Polyarchy of City-States, which it unites in the Henarchy of the one City-State from the outside. Its association is no longer internal and of kindred stocks, but external, of stocks which formed no ingredient of the original city. Thus it pushes out to its third belt—the Mediterranean—the previous belts be-

ing the urban and the ethnic (or the purely Roman and the Italic).

But the great fact of this period is that Rome employs a new form of association—the Province governed by a pro-consul with personal and quite absolute power. To be sure he is nominally responsible to the Senate and is usually a Senator; thus the Senate is rearing out of itself a number of absolute rulers, which is the germ of the Empire.

Here, too, we behold the City-State seeking to make itself universal, to put under itself all communities, tribes, nations. Thus it has contradicted its former associative principle, which was to have Rome (S. P. Q. R.) the medium of all interpolitical association. The Province it cuts off and hands over to a governor who is a person and one of its members. Provincial association develops the one-man power; through it each Senator will be king, autocrat. The Province has not, therefore, the original Roman associative process. Hence arises the dualism betweeen Province and Rome, which will produce a great deal of Roman History.

The present period in which Rome subdues the world and associates it with herself lasts from 281 till 133, when a new movement starts.

(III.) *The World associates Rome.* The counter stream begins to set in, the World starts for Rome in order to associate it. For the

World in becoming Roman must also have Rome's power of association, must appropriate the associative source in order to be truly Romanized. Moreover, in so far as Rome associated the World externally and through violence, so she is to be associated externally and through violence. The World is determined to become a sharer in the Roman associative process.

The movement of the World toward the center will not be rapid and of course will be resisted by the exclusive center. First the Latin outsider will try to get inside, he being nearest to Rome, in place and in blood; the result is a desperate struggle (the so-called Latin War). But the Italic peoples and finally the Provincials are made sharers in Rome, when the Empire comes. Thus each element (community, tribe, nation) gets to be associative not only of itself and of its kindred folk, but of the whole civilized world. Rome turns to be the vindicator of the associative right of each element, not merely of its own—but that is properly the Empire.

But this third division of Roman Republican History (133–31 B. C.) is the movement toward universal association against the particular association of the City-State (S. P. Q. R.) which could associate only in the one way, outwards, by a species of subjection, by taking away intercommunal rights. She could not reverse herself without a deep convulsion; she could not be asso-

ciated by those whom she had associated, nor be subjected to her own subjects. To perform this revolution (or turning around), the Great Individual enters, whom she has reared by putting down City-States and Nations on the border. He has trained an army devoted to himself rather than to the one distant City-State, which he proceeds to put down in turn when it does not obey his Will. He associates it gradually with himself as leader of a provincial army (Sulla and Caesar are the great examples).

Thus the World having been first associated by Rome, gets to share in its process by the Strong Roman, who reduces it to an element along with himself and the World. The Great Man of the third epoch returns to Rome and subjects it, and thus associates it with himself really through the Provinces. The central City-State no longer dominates, but is a part, a constituent of this new Roman process in which the long-suppressed one-man power has again come to the surface.

In this manner we seek to periodize the total sweep of Rome as republic, beholding its stages pivot on its fundamental category of association. Thus the mind keeps in its presence the living, ever-moving unity of Roman History, which active unity vitalizes every portion, even the smallest, of the vast historic organism. This process of the whole in the part the student is not to let slip from his thought as he works

through the multitudinous details of the subject, since it is their ordering principle.

VIII. Rome has her inner or partisan conflicts, which run parallel to her outer conflicts in subjecting and associating other cities and peoples. These Roman parties are not of the same sort nor do they have the same end. They have distinct lines which, however, cross one another, producing no little confusion in the mind of the reader who has not traced them out and defined them separately. For instance there is a set of men who have the right of citizenship but no wealth. Then there is another set who have wealth but lack rights. Each is seeking to get what it has not and forms a party. This criss-cross of Roman parties and their contests we shall seek to analyze briefly in its main outlines.

(1) The class-conflict is the strife between the parties called Patricians and Plebeians, the privileged and the unprivileged, the governing and the governed. To a certain extent the claim of birth enters, and the struggle rises between the high-born and the low-born, the nobles and the commons. But the question here chiefly turns upon participation in the government. The Patricians claim to own the machine, and the right to run it is exclusively theirs. The Plebeians insist upon a share, in fact an equal share, and finally they get it after many and long struggles. The underlying impulse of

their party is self-government, though on another side they too will show themselves narrow and self-contradictory.

(2) The social conflict is that between the propertied and the propertiless, the landed and the landless, or in general the rich and the poor. The Roman territory originally was owned in the main by small proprietors who cultivated the soil on their own account, yet also were soldiers for the state. The great socio-economic tendency of Rome was to absorb these little farms into great estates cultivated by slaves. The result was the old Roman soldier began also to vanish. Hence came a great effort to stop this tendency, chiefly by agrarian laws which divided the public domain among the landless Romans. There were poor Patricians as well rich Plebeians, so that the social conflict does always coincide with the class-conflict.

(3) The associative conflict is that between those inside the political body (S. P. Q. R.) and those outside, or that between Romans and subject non-Romans, the latter being communities and peoples conquered and associated—Latins, Italians, Provincials, freedmen and even slaves. All these, incorporated in the Roman State, were more or less the rightless element seeking to be righted. They differed from the Plebeians, who were at first a class inside the government, though not on an equality of right with the Pa-

tricians. Now it is a fact that the Plebeians could be as exclusive toward outsiders as the Patricians were toward them; they had no wish to share their gift of Roman citizenship. Caius Gracchus was deserted by his party, the Plebeians, and he perished because he had proposed to give the Roman franchise to the Latins.

The associative conflict was really a class conflict of a new and wider reach than that between Plebeians and Patricians, which was confined to the limited City-State. The time comes when the Allies in Italy and the Provincials beyond Italy are knocking at the door of the exclusive Roman Government and wish to be admitted. We may deem them the new sort of Plebeians seeking equality of right with Rome which is now the City-State as Patrician, though its classes have been internally equalized. In general, the World as Plebeian will break into the excluding walls of the Roman citadel where rights are stored, and get possession of them also, quite as the old Plebeians did, who now, however, try to keep out the new Plebeians.

Many are the illustrations of these three kinds of conflict in Roman History, some of which will be noted as they rise along the line of exposition. Undoubtedly the basic act of the early Republic was the inner overcoming of Classism, of the political distinction between Plebeians and Patricians. From this act Rome's power of as-

sociation really begins; she learns it from within, and then proceeds to function it outside herself. Yet the class-conflict is often crossed by the ever-recurring social conflict, and sweeps beyond its original urban limits into the world, with which the associative conflict takes place.

IX. All periodicity of History is determined by the end of the same, which is ultimately the State universal. This is what calls forth the three fundamental divisions—Orient, Europe, Occident (p. 67). In the final historic view one has to see to what extent any particular State (like Rome in the present case) represents and indeed realizes the State universal. Every stage of History, be it that of the World or that of Europe, or that of a European nation, gets therein its ultimate criterion. We already find that Rome has at least two historic ends: that of all History, and that of her own special History; so has every important State. Rome is, therefore, a stage in the total movement toward the State universal; but she also seeks to realize her own universality, to make universal in her historic career her own fundamental principle which we have called Association. This is seen in her last great historic act, through which she imparts, or is made to impart, her gift to the World, whereby the latter asscoiates her in turn.

Here we may repeat, for the thought needs to be often repeated, that the world-historical pur-

pose or power which we find always working in the particular State, especially at its supreme pivotal moments, has its special designation as the World-Spirit. When the individual shares in it, and becomes its executor, mediating it with his People, he is the Great Man of the epoch, who, however, may be otherwise not very great.

Each of the three divisions of Roman History above given is in itself a process, and hence is sub-divided into the separate stages of said process, which are again three, being ultimately psychical. Still further, each of these sub-periods, or epochs we may call them, has its triple process also, which is really the germinal form, the embryonic cell (to take a physical analogy) of Roman History. The repetition of this cell, if carried out into all the historic details, would be almost numberless, as in the human organism. But since we have to be brief and to take vast sweeps, we shall unfold only nine of these embryonic processes of the total historic organism of Rome, as they incorporate themselves in the leading occurrences and men. Accordingly the scheme will run as follows:

(A). The inner Conflict: this shows Rome's inner development through the struggle of parties of various kinds, and is her continually recurring element of Self-Association.

(B). The outer Conflict; this shows Rome's

outer development through the struggle with other communities and peoples, her so-called conquests. Here is to be placed the continually recurring element of Rome's Association of the World.

(C). Great Men; this is in general the mediating element of both the inner and outer Conflicts. Rome's employment and treatment of this mediating individual are peculiar and significant. Always present and active, even if underneath, he becomes uppermost when the World through him starts to associate Rome.

Such, then, is the outline of the thrice three germinal processes of Roman History, as we construe it. This little cycle recurs in every epoch (or sub-period) and is the heart of it, always beating and keeping it going. We should observe that it gives in small the total movement of Rome in large: her Self-Association, her World-Association, and the World's Association of her in turn through the Great Man. Rome's Whole is thus reflected in every part, which thereby becomes truly a part of the great Roman Whole.

These divisions, somewhat abstract and bare as here formulated in advance, must now be seen ordering all the varied occurrences of Roman History.

Section First.

Rome Associates Herself.

A conception to which we shall often have to recur is original Rome as a locality on the Tiber, at which three different Italic peoples or nations meet in a common point. From this common point they ray out in three different directions; in general the Latin nation lies on the South, the Etruscan on the North, and the Sabellian on the East. Each of these three peoples furnished an original element, an ethnic constituent in the making of oldest Rome. The primordial form of this ethnic constituent was a Village Community situated on one of the hills of Rome. Thus three separate Village Communities—a Latin, a Sabellian, and an Etruscan—capping three of Rome's seven hills may be taken as the pre-supposition of Roman History. Such is, indeed, its primal starting point, showing the germinal separation which Rome is to overcome both in herself and in her environing world.

Very naturally these communities get to fighting, and the rift remains in one form or other to the end. But the far more important fact is that they always after struggle get together again and associate, starting and developing that peculiar associative power which becomes the

fundamental characteristic of historical Rome through her whole career.

First, then, Rome is to associate herself, is to form into a political Whole all the dissident factors which have entered into her original make-up, and have developed out of the same. The full sweep of this Self-Association will embrace not only the unification of the three primal Village Communities but also the separated Classes, and finally of the three diverse Peoples which entered into the three original Village Communities. Accordingly our first grand division of Roman History will show three stages of the association of the City-State—communal, civic, and ethnic.

The time of this first period of Roman History embracing Rome's Self-Association in its total sweep, is relatively very long—no less than 473 years out of Rome's 723 years, reckoned from her foundation till the battle of Actium in 31 B.C., when the Empire properly begins. That makes it almost twice as long as the two other periods put together. But the early times of Rome were not so full of History as the later, she was of slow growth, it was a far harder task to associate herself than the World. Strictly she has no World's History during this long preparation for it; not till the Second Period, when she comes in conflict with the Greek City-State (about 281), does she begin actually her

world-historical career, though the possibility of it lay in her long before.

Though this period be long and seemingly disproportionate as to years, we have to put it under the one rubric of Rome's Self-Association, which evolves through the three stages already designated as communal, civic, and ethnic. The first of these is now to be considered.

I.

Communal Association.

The thing given in advance, then, is the three ethnic communities, out of which all Roman History is to evolve. Of course the question rises: Whence come these communities? We may repeat that they have been deposited by that great Aryan migration which long since descended into Italy at various times, and there left the three considerable peoples—Latins, Sabellians and Etruscans—which begin to abut against one another in that little corner called Rome. Note that these three peoples are of the same blood far back, of which relationship, however, they have lost all knowledge. But now they are to be associated by a new tie and in a new kinship, they are to become consanguine with Rome, who will at last unite them with herself in a common political bond.

Such is, then, the function of Rome: she must

begin to associate peoples who have been hitherto dissociated, separated and strewn all over Italy and around the Mediterranean. The divisive tendency of man's institutions must be stopped, if humanity is ever going to be united and to get conscious of unity. Rome now starts a unitary movement mid a chaos of barbarism—starts in a very small way with what we here call Communal Association, or the coalescence of three little communities ethnically different. This is what chiefly takes place in the time of the Roman kings, lasting some 244 years (754–510 B.C.) according to the received chronology.

During the entire regal time the chief problem of Rome was, then, to associate her three constituent communities. This we designate as her inner conflict. But she had also her external problem: Self-defense against other communities with which the Campagna was dotted and which lined the Sabine Mountains. Moreover, Rome showed quite from the beginning her bent for associating other communities with herself externally, showed what is often called her lust of conquest. Likewise we behold that third element of Rome's character: her development of Great Individuals for carrying out her aims, or for realizing her associative power.

There has always been some question about periodizing these Roman kings. Usually their

time is regarded as a co-ordinate period with the other leading periods in the division of the History of Rome. That, however, throws it out of its due place and order. It should be a sub-period under the general period which we call Rome's Self-Association, which extends to the time of Pyrrhus invading Italy. As already hinted, Rome in associating herself completely, must take up her three consanguine peoples. Such a stage the kings are far from reaching. But they do unite and bring into mutual kinship the three small ethnic communities of which Rome is constituted.

Of this communal association belonging to the regal time, we behold the three stages already indicated, which are next to be looked at separately.

A. *Inner Conflict.* It is evident that there must have been no small amount of inner struggle in bringing about the association and to a degree the amalgamation of the three refractory communal atoms, differing from one another in customs, religion, and kinship. Each of the seven kings is represented as having his special function as well as trouble in forwarding the great act of coalescence. But the outcome of the regal epoch (or sub-period) is the making of Rome as a City-State which has associated three separate ethnic communities

and thereby has won an associative character for the future.

Under the name of Romulus, the first founder of Rome, is given the earliest process of the three communities in forming the one political organism. Romulus took possession of the Palatine Mount, walled it and made what is known as Roma Quadrata. The Sabines occupied the Quirinal at first under their king, Titus Tatius. At this earliest time also we hear of the Etruscan settlement on the Cælian Hill under Cæles Vibenna, though the time of Etruscan supremacy comes later, with the Tarquins.

Now each of these settlements, which are Village Communities, has its own governmental form, which has already been set forth as the process of Demos, Aristos, and Monarchos. It was the peculiar function of Romulus, as founder, to make these communities one by being put under one government.

We read that his political organization was composed of the three following elements:

(1) The body of citizens or burgesses with their clients and possibly slaves was the People. This was made up of three tribes: Ramnes (Romans), Tities (Sabines), and Luceres (doubtless Etruscans). Thus each original ethnic constituent is recognized, and all are brought into one Assembly called the Curiate (Comitia Curiata) from the subdivision of each tribe into

ten curiæ, or wards. Laws were passed by a majority of the Curiæ voting for them. And the king had not a legal right to rule till confirmed by the Curiate Assembly, indicating thus a species of elective Monarchy. (2) The Senate or Council of Elders (Aristos) was composed of 300 members finally, each ethnic constituent with its hundred. (3) The third element was the king (Monarchos), who was general in war and had as bodyguard 300 knights (Celeres), each tribe furnishing its contingent.

So the three communities are made one by transferring their very similar organization to the single compound community. It was a phase of what the Greeks called *synoikismos*, with the distinction that the villages here were ethnically heterogeneous, whereas those in Greece (as at Athens and Sparta) were homogeneous. That makes a great difference between the Greek and Roman City-State in associative power. The former will never be able to associate separate tribes even of Greeks; the latter is going to associate all Italians, and even the Mediterranean peoples, including those very Greeks who could never associate themselves nationally or even tribally. We should also notice the three primal constituents — Demos, Aristos, and Monarchos—taking on their Roman form in this earliest record.

Here we may note that one of the principal

variations in this early Roman Constitution was the establishment of the Centuries by Servius Tullius, who classified the entire Roman People according to a new principle, that of property. Hence his scheme has been called a *timocracy*, a form of government adopted by a number of the Greek City-States of Italy and Sicily, and having its suggestion at least in the Solonian legislation. The dispute between the two Classes, Patricians and Plebeians, was already growing bitter, and Servius purposed evidently to get rid of that inner dualism by a new set of Classes, which had little or no regard to birth and privilege, but to wealth. The political result, however, was that he established two new sources of legislative power, the Assembly of the Centuries, and the Assembly of the Tribes, which are now plebeian. These two Assemblies will play a great part in the inner development of the Roman Constitution, largely supplanting the Curiate Assembly of Romulus.

B. *Outer Conflict.* Alongside of Rome's whole time of internal association with its conflicts runs a line of external association with its struggles and wars. She always shows this double thread of existence, an inner and outer, the latter being now the subject of consideration. Romulus very soon had trouble with his Sabine neighbors, as is recounted in the famous

legend of the Rape of Sabine women, in which lies the meaning that he forced from those neighbors the right of intermarriage (*jus connubii*) previously refused. The result was the association of the Sabines with the Romans. It is said that Romulus brought into his new community the Etruscans of the Cælian Hill who had helped him in the Sabine war, and who thus constituted the third ethnic element in the composition of the young City-State.

It is also transmitted that Romulus had wars with other surrounding communities—Sabine, Etruscan, Latin. But he is the typical hero and founder of Rome, because he associated them all, instead of destroying them or enslaving them. Such at least was the principle which later Romans read into his career. The great historian, Tacitus, looking back from the second century of the empire through more than 800 years of Rome's existence, makes a pivotal statement of the deepest Roman principle for all that time, attributing it to the Founder: *At noster conditor Romulus tantum sapientia valuit ut presosque populos eodem die hostes, dein cives habuerit.* (*Annales XI.* 24).

Thus the imperial Roman takes an idealizing retrospect of the beginning and puts into the soul of Romulus the genetic principle of Roman development, which was plain enough in his day. For this ideal Founder of Rome at once (*eodem*

die) makes citizens out of his captive enemies, associating them in the City-State. We shall see that the process was by no means so rapid as Tacitus seems to think; in fact, all Roman History is in substance the complete evolution of this associative principle—at least as complete as Rome could make it. We must recollect that in the time of the historian the Roman City-State was imparting its institutional gifts to all the world, especially the gift of association.

Altogether different was this from the Greek conception and conduct of the City-State. Very suggestive is it, therefore, to listen to a Greek writing on this subject somewhere about the Christian Era—Dionysius of Halicarnasus (*Antiq Rom. II.* 16). He declares that the above mentioned policy of Romulus was "the best of all policies and one which the Greeks ought to practice;" in his opinion it was that which "secured Roman freedom," and which "chiefly led to Roman supremacy," as she did not "destroy captured cities, nor slaughter captured peoples, nor wholly appropriate their land for herds." While she sent out her own colonies to conquered territories in part, she also "shared her polity with other cities." So Greek Dionysius appreciates Roman association in contrast with the Greek political method, carrying it back, however, to Romulus as the originator—

wherein he doubtless followed his Roman authorities.

The other Roman kings, with the exception of Numa, during whose reign there is said to have been unbroken peace, carried on their external wars in the same general way as the typical Romulus. Round about Rome lay numerous communities belonging to the three peoples—Latin, Sabine, and Etruscan. The details of these petty wars cannot be here given; in them we can see Rome pursuing her primal task, which is to associate first her ethnic relatives, ere she can proceed to her vaster work.

C. Great Men. The Seven Kings were Rome's Great Men of the first epoch, the regal. The Roman youth knew their names and their deeds by heart; the modern schoolboy studying his outline of Ancient History, can tell of the Seven Roman Kings, long after he has forgotten the Roman Emperors, excepting Julius Caesar and Augustus. It is on the whole a well-rounded group, performing certain definite functions, building the basic institutions of the Grand City-State which bridges antiquity over into our modern world. Not very concrete do they seem, but rather Roman abstractions: we may deem them Roman personifications of principles projected back into the front of History. Rome has thus pictured her origin in a line of individuals, who are, however, to be cast aside at the beginning

of a new epoch. The cessation of the Seven Kings marks sharply the transition into a new stage of evolution.

Into this quite abstract substrate the mythical element enters with its play of supernatural occurrences. The result is that early Roman History has been critically analyzed, and its authenticity challenged. In this case as in so many others we are to see that the Mythus can have an historic meaning, though not an historic form. The deepest truth, the solidest fact often puts on the dress of fiction. In such a manner we shall have to consider the transmitted record of of the Seven Roman Kings, and indeed much other early History. We cannot leave it away without a great gap, and we cannot quite accept it literally as it is. In many a bit of legend the narrative of the Seven Kings gives the primordial genetic act of Rome, the triple ethnic association of circumjacent communities which thus make the core of the grand Roman expansion. Many a short flash into Rome's future world-historical destiny may be seen in these legends. In fact the Roman kings must have been largely the creation of later ages. More or less they represent tendencies, principles, which run through Roman History from beginning to end.

The first fact which should be seen in regard to the Seven Kings, is that they are put together in three groups according to their ethnic affin-

ities. The first and third, Romulus and Tullus Hostilius were Romans (or Latins), the latter king being the warlike repetition of the former. The second and fourth were Sabines, Numa and Ancus Martius, both of whom developed the religious and peaceful character in the people. This alternation of supreme authority between Romans and Sabines probably indicates the equality of the two ethnic elements, and the earliest form of Rome's association. But the third group, consisting of the last three kings, Tarquinius Priscus, Servius Tullius, and Tarquinius Superbus, was Etruscan, a pretty sure indication that the Etruscan element had obtained the supremacy in the city over the Latins and the Sabines. But this supremacy is overthrown in the time of the last Tarquin, doubtless by the combination of the other two ethnic elements.

Another reason is usually given for the expulsion of Tarquin the Proud: he became a tyrant and assailed the rights of the Senate as well as of the People, whereat these two classes united to drive him out. Such is the political ground: Aristos and Demos co-operate to get rid of Monarchos, the third element in the process of the State. And they do get rid of it so completely that centuries elapse before it comes back openly. But why not choose another king who will not be a tyrant, the other six kings having been good and mostly popular men? The truth is that a

monarch would have to be one of the three peoples—Roman, Sabine, Etruscan; two of them would always see to it that the third did not get the king. Thus he became a bone of contention, and a hindrance to harmony; hence they resolved to do without him. In other words kingship had come to stand in the way of the more complete association of the diverse ethnic constituents of Rome. So the king became a curse to them, a veritable obstruction to their destiny. Some such thing the Romans must have felt in their new-born hatred of the very name of king, which has always seemed so inexplicable and even contradictory. For the most revered name in their history, Romulus, was that of a king, and the People idolized Servius Tullius, preserving his memory and his institutions to a great extent. The only way was to establish a government in which all three component elements might take part. Such was the Senate with its 300 members, a hundred from each ethnic branch; such were the three tribes of Romulus, and such were also the People as a whole. The triple ethnic division rendered kingship impossible, and compelled a new kind of government, which suppressed the one-man power with life-tenure.

That the expulsion of Tarquin had the deeper ethnic substrate underlying its political character is shown by subsequent events. Tarquin at once

appealed to the nearest Etruscan cities, Veii and Tarquinii, for help in restoring the national influence at Rome. When they were beaten off he carried his request to the highest Etruscan power, Lars Porsena of Clusium, head of the Etruscan league. But even he did not succeed in bringing kingship to Rome, though he took the city according to one account. Tarquin then tried his Latin allies, but these were defeated at the battle of Lake Regillus.

Such is our view of the course of Early Roman History, a view which, we regret to say, has not the support of either Niebuhr or Mommsen, but which is a necessary inference, as the matter seems to us, from what the ancient historians of Rome have handed down to us. The key is a conception of the three ethnic constituents of the primal City-State, and their continual interaction, which leads to their association. The question comes up, What did each of these three peoples contribute to the Roman character?

There is no doubt that the Latin people furnished the dominating element to Rome. The Latins had a better system of leagues than any other Italic nation, and were accordingly more deeply inclined to association, which in its germ they seem to have imparted to Rome through her founder Romulus, who was a Latin. From the same source springs the fact that the Latin tongue prevailed against the Sabellian and the

Etruscan in Rome, though probably she was for a long time tri-lingual. Language is a product of human association, not of an individual; man communicates with man through it and so develops its power. If the Latins were the more deeply associative people, their speech must have shown the same character, and have asserted itself as the linguistic vehicle of the associative City-State. In general Latium gave to Rome her political and social institutions in a large measure.

The Sabines gave to the new city its religious forms through the Sabine king Numa Pompilius. Such was the Roman traditional statement, which makes Numa (allied to *nomos*) a kind of religious lawgiver. The Sabine mountaineers were naturally more religious than the men of the plain (Latins). Still in Rome religion was always suspiciously subordinate to political ends: Romulus was before Numa. Moreover from these Sabine mountaineers came Rome's military toughness and her unshaken obstinacy in defeat, which belonged to the Sabellian stock, and especially to the Sammites, who would have conquered Rome if they had possessed also her associative, or Latin quality.

What was the Etruscan contribution to the Roman character? In general it may be called the cultural. Etruria was a land of culture in comparison with the early Latins and Sabellians. Certain portions of the Roman religious ritual,

as the art of taking the auspices, were Etruscan in origin, but the chief religious fact of the Etruscan people was their occupation with the future state, as we see in their tombs. But this was not a Roman trait. Etruscan cities show the influence of Greece in art, mythology, literature; Greek culture probably first began to trickle into early Rome through Etruria. The first Tarquin is said to have had a Corinthian father. Livy states (IX 36) that Roman boys were sent to study in Etruria at an early time, as they in his time devoted themselves to Greek learning. Thus it would seem that Etruscan culture held sway at Rome long before the Greek was directly known. Moreover the Etruscans were a seafaring people, which the Sabellians were not, nor indeed the Latins to any extent. Rome was a river city, yet easily accessible by sea; Etruscan navigation probably opened to her the first glimpse of the Mediterranean world, which she was afterward to associate. Already Carthage was known to her, and made with her a treaty in the first year of the Republic. Civilization began to flow into early Rome through the Etruscan element, but the stern self-sacrifice of the Roman to his community was more Sabellian. Curtius and Decius Mus devote their lives directly to their city. Brutus and Manlius punish their own sons for transgression; Regulus, Fab-

ricius, Cincinnatus were hardly Etruscan characters.

Such at least were the three primordial ethnic constituents of Rome whose first problem was to associate them into a working political organism. Let us bring before us the separative condition which is the starting point of the new city. Each of the communities had its own religion, institutions, language, as well as its own distinct ethnic connection. The unique thing is that these three independent, mutually repellent monads show the tendency and the ability to get associated—which is verily the great coming fact in the World's History. Rome therefore starts as tri-lingual, tri-religious, tri-institutional, tri-ethnic, as well as tri-communal, but she associates all her threes into the one process of her City-State during the epoch of the Seven Kings.

II.

Civic Association.

We now have before us the second great act of Rome's Self-Association: the Classes of her citizens, especially the main ones, the Patricians and Plebeians, become united and co-operant in a common civic equality. This is often called the equalization of the Orders or Classes of the City-State, and is the preliminary condition of Rome's vast external conquests. She has to

conquer herself before conquering the World. And indeed this inner self-subjugation was quite as difficult a matter for her as the subjugation of the World, if we compare the different lengths of time in which each was accomplished. As we mark it off, this period of Civic Association lasted from 510 to 366 B. C.—from the expulsion of the Kings to the installation of the first Plebeian consul. The victory of equalization was then won, though the contest continued over minor positions till the Hortensian Law (286) made again the enactments of the Assembly of the Tribes legally binding upon the whole Roman People. Thus the Plebeians had their own co-ordinate legislative power, and the so-called Plebiscite now comes into existence with the force of a law. Thereby in one sense the dualism of the State is deepened, but the new Senate shows itself the reconciling element.

The previous epoch, that of the Kings, has been chiefly occupied with communal Association, or the welding together of the original communities which constituted Rome. The outcome of this development has been the expulsion of the one-man power, the Monarchos, with his life-tenure of authority, and the possession of the government by the two remaining powers, Aristos and Demos, both of whom seemed to have heartily concurred in getting rid of their third institutional constituent, whom they de-

scribed as a tyrant. The same process was not peculiar to Rome, but we find it repeated throughout the Greco-Italic world. In Greece this regal time of Rome was a period of tyrannies, some of them famous and playing a great historic part, as did those of the Athenian Pisistratus, the Samian Polycrates, the Corinthian Periander. The strong ruler or Monarchos, usually aided by Demos, put down Aristos, and governed the City-State as his own, according to his will. Then came the reaction. Through some arbitrary act Demos gets estranged, and joins with Aristos in expelling the tyrant. Sometimes Demos then controls, and democracy sets in, as at Athens; often, however, Aristos is able to seize and keep the reins of power, as was the case essentially at Rome. In general we see that the City-State, the highest form of ancient government, is going through the process of trying all its constituents—Monarchos, Aristos, and Demos—as it were testing them in turn with supremacy, to show what each will do with its charge.

The expulsion of Monarchos resulting in the triumph of Aristos is not then an isolated phenomenon of the time. It is a case of the governmental form of antiquity working itself out through all its stages. Still Rome must have had something peculiar which enabled it to take into itself all other states of the ancient world.

This was the spirit of association which sprang from the original act which made Rome. Demos, almost rightless at the start of the Republic, will show itself aggressive, but always associative in its conflicts with Aristos, who at bottom reveals the same character, often indeed under compulsion. In the epoch before us (the second) Demos reveals the better stuff for State-building, and will at last impart its mettle to Aristos in forming the new Senate which is to conquer and govern the world.

Still we are to see that in the new Republic, Monarchos is not by any means eliminated and cannot be without breaking down the governmental process itself. Verily the State cannot be without that connecting link in which the Many must be one Will which controls the total organism. But the Roman could not endure the King, the one ruling individual with life-tenure and personal authority. So he cuts him in two and calls the double Monarchos by the name of Consuls, whose term of office is to last for a year only. But this dualism of the head is found to cleave the whole body of the State and to make it incapable of marching, especially in an emergency. The result is that in a few years (498) the dictator is called for, with the absolute power of the Monarchos, having the right of life and death over each citizen without appeal for six months, after which he can be

called to account. This dictator was first named by one of the Consuls, who thus invoked a whole authority above his own halfness, evidently to restore the broken process of the State. But the special ground of its origination is not known. Possibly this new authority was first used to overtop the Plebeian right of appeal (*provocatio*) from the sentence of any magistrate to the assembly of the people. This was the famous Valerian law (named from its author, Valerius Poplecola), which may be regarded as the first right of the Plebeians against Patrician insolence and wrong (assigned to the year 509).

We shall now look at the inner and outer conflicts of this epoch, and at the great individuals to whom fame has assigned leading parts in its events.

A *The inner conflict.* This shows the gradual rise of the Plebeians through persistent effort to gain political equality with the Patricians, who through the power in their hands resisted it at every step. On the whole here is the most instructive account on record of the ever-recurring fight between Aristos and Demos (aristocracy and democracy), with victory for the latter. One hundred and forty-four years the struggle lasts, as we look at it, culminating in triumph when Lucius Sextius becomes the first Plebeian consul (366). It is not saying too much that

Rome's inner character which makes her the world-conqueror and world-ruler, or as we prefer to put it, the world-associator, is being now developed. The Plebeians do not destroy or expel their opponents but associate them, and thus form the real Roman City-State (S. P. Q. R.) What has been done in small at Rome, is next to be done in large over Italy and the World. As the Plebeians have step by step subdued and associated the Patricians, and thus produced practically a new government, so they both as united are to go forth together, subduing and associating their destined World, which embraces the Mediterranean lands. Hence the present inner conflict may be regarded as the training of Rome to her world-historical task. We are not to forget that the Patricians also are transformed in this long discipline, even through their opposition. Almost in spite of themselves the hide-bound aristocracy imbibes the Plebeian spirit, which is that which wins. This will show itself particularly in their own political home, the Senate.

In ordering this long epoch and its multifarious seethings, we shall throw it into its three chief acts, round which its many events gather as centers, and which form together the total process of the one leading principle. These three chief acts are known in Roman History as the Tribunate, the Decemvirate, and the

Licinian Rogations (or laws). Each must be grasped in itself, and then all three are to be seen as one process.

(I) *The Tribunate.* Not long after the expulsion of the kings, the severe law of debtor and creditor began to produce great distress among the Plebeians who were the debtors, while the Patricians chiefly were the creditors. These debts were largely incurred in the wars following the expulsion of Tarquin, when the Plebeians had to serve as soldiers, as well as pay heavy taxes. For a final non-payment of debt, the creditor could have the debtor enslaved, killed or even cut to pieces, if there were several creditors, each taking a slice of flesh according to the size of his debt. At last the special case of an old solidier starts the sympathies of the people, and the outcome is a Secession of the Plebs to the Sacred Mount, where they propose to build their own city about two miles from Rome.

Thus arose the prospect of the two Classes separating and making two Romes. Embassies came from the Senate, urging the Plebeians to return. Menenius Agrippa tells to their simple souls the homely fable of the Belly and the Members, suggesting that both are necessary parts of one organism. There is no doubt that this Secession contradicted the spirit of association, which had been already developed in both

Classes during the regal time. So after the first ebullition a compromise was possible. Relief from the pressure of debt was granted, though the social conflict between the rich and poor, between capital and labor (as the formulation now runs) remained to vex Roman History to the last day of the Republic.

But the great point gained was the political one—the Tribunate. Two Plebeians, called Tribunes, were appointed to protect their Class against the injustice or cruelty of Patrician magistrates. Out of this simple power will develop the Tribunician Veto (*intercessio*) which can stop legislation, annul the power of the Senate and of the Consul, in fine can stop the wheels of all government. Thus it came to represent the dualism of the Roman State in its most acrid form, and clearly brought to the consciousness of both Classes the gulf which had to be bridged, if they were to perform their world-historical task. The Tribunate was the negative might of the Plebeians against the Patrician ownership of the government; in it the Roman City-State recognized and granted the power of its own self-annulment. The governing Class has now found its first limit; the Patriciate is no longer absolute by law. It is evident that this destructive power of the Plebeians must be made constructive and co-operant, if the

State is ever to be sound; the Classes, now dissociative, are to become associative.

The Tribunes were at first chosen by the Centuriate Assembly composed of both Classes; a new law (the Publilian) gives the right of their election to the Plebeian assembly of the Tribes (471). A later law (the Valerian) extended this right so that the assembly of the Tribes (Plebeian) made enactments legally binding on all the Roman people (449). Thus a legislative equality is attained. But this properly comes after the Decemvirate when the second Secession of the Plebs takes place.

It was evident to all parties that the Patrician assertion of the law and the Tribunician negation of this assertion were tearing the State in twain, both being equally arbitrary. How can the contradiction be harmonized? By a published code of laws which everybody may see and know, and which is to bind the consular judges. This reasonable proposal came from a Tribune, C. Terentilius Arsa, but it was bitterly opposed by the Patricians. After much bickering an agreement was reached in 454, men were sent to Greece to get good laws and bring them back to Rome, and in 451 the Decemvirs were chosen.

(2) *The Decemvirate.* Ten men were elected (451) to make the new laws which were to be set up in the Forum on a brazen tablet. Both Classes were eligible, but Patricians only were

actually elected. Moreover these Decemvirs were not only to compile a code, but they were the supreme magistrates of the State—administrators and judges—while the work was in the process of being done. That is, the Consuls were superseded as well as the Tribunes; even the right of appeal was suspended. Thus the two hostile groups of officials representing their two Classes, were set aside in an attempt to unify the government. The Patrician assertion of authority and the Plebeian negation of it were given up to the new order.

During the first year Ten Tables of laws were written out and adopted. They became, as Livy says, the fountain of all Roman law, public and private; also the official conduct of the first set of Decemvirs was noted for its justice and fairness to all parties. Still the Ten Tables were found to need a supplement, and a new body of Decemvirs were chosen who added two Tables (450), making them twelve. But these two last Tables show a different spirit in several ways; particularly offensive was the re-affirmation of the law against the intermarriage of Patricians and Plebeians. Also the official conduct of the second Decemvirate was bad, savoring of usurpation and tyranny. Two outrages, the murder of the bravest man in the Roman army, the Plebeian L. Siccius Dentatus, and the attempt of the Decemvir Appius upon the maiden Virginia,

led to a second Secession of the Plebs who flocked to their quarter upon the Aventine. Again the two Classes had separated in wrath, and two Romes had arisen in the heart of the one Rome and were getting ready to fight each other. Thus the furious Roman dualism sprang up again, more passionate than ever, and had even shown itself in the two sets of Tables of the Law, and in the two sets of Decemvirs. Can the two recalcitrant Classes ever get associated? For that is their problem. We may suppose that in a short time both sides began to cool off and to feel the inner contradiction of their present situation with their deepest civic impulse, which from their origin was associative.

This time it would seem that the first effort at conciliation came from the Senate. The result was a compromise known as the Valerio-Horatian laws, which largely brought a restoration of old status between the Classes. The Tribunate was restored, and the right of appeal; also the assembly of the Tribes was empowered to enact laws for the whole people, and thus was made co-ordinate with the Centuriate Assembly. In this way legislation is equalized yet doubled, which undoes the unity sought for by the Decemvirate. Still the Twelve Tables remain, making the law public and open to all. Thus the knowledge of it is no longer a private and

secret possession of the Patriciate, who could once twist it as they chose.

Such is the gain for the Plebeians, no doubt considerable. Otherwise Rome (S. P. Q. R.) has dropped back into its former dualism of Classes, which is in some respects deepened. For the Plebeians now stand face to face with the Patricians, having new rights and a new consciousness of them, as well as a new will to maintain and extend them. The Patrician Consuls are also restored over against the restoration of the Plebeian Tribunes, each side having now its chosen leaders. The Plebeians make a fresh attack upon privilege by the Canuleian law, which after much turmoil and and another probably small Secession of the Plebs to Janiculum (not mentioned by Livy or Dionysius) was enacted in 445, doing away with the odious law against intermarriage of the Classes. This destroyed the legal existence of the Roman aristocracy of birth. Also one of the consulships was demanded by the Plebeians, who thus laid claim to share in the chief Patrician office. This was staved off for a time by the appointment of Military Tribunes, eligible from both Classes. Somewhat later the office of Quæstor was opened to the Plebeians, who through it could enter the Senate. The Gallic danger had the effect of toning down party strife for a good many years. But when the cloud passes, the final act of the

civic struggle begins. Two Tribunes, C. Lincinius Stolo and L. Sextius in 376 introduced a new set of laws known under the following title.

(3) *The Licinian Rogations.* Two of the three enactments were evidently for the benefit of the poor Plebeians; the one relieved the debtor from the exactions of the money-lender, and the other helped the small farmer by limiting the infringements of the great landlords upon the public domain. Similar enactments to these two had already occurred in Roman History.

But the epoch-making provision was that the old consulship should be restored, without the military Tribunes, and that one of the Consuls had to be a Plebeian. To this was afterwards added that the keepers of the Sibylline books should also be in part Plebeians, who thus began to share in the religious control of Rome. A long, desperate struggle took place, till in 367 all the provisions passed, and the next year saw L. Sextius the first Plebeian Consul, not however without a compromise which gave the judicial function of the Consul to a new officer, called the Prætor, who was a Patrician. The door was opened, not to be shut again; ten years later (356) we hear of the first Plebeian dictator, and in five years more (351) follows the first Plebeian censor.

It is evident that this great work was accomplished by the union of the poor and rich Ple-

beians, whom the Patricians often artfully turned against each other. The first two enactments favor the poor Plebeians, which the Patricians offered at once to accept, thinking to divide thereby the opposition, and to bring about the rejection of the third enactment which concerned chiefly the rich Plebeians who were striving for political equality. But the Licinian leadership was superb and held the party together against all the machinations of their foes.

As a symbol of the reconciliation of the two Classes, the Temple of Concord was vowed by old Camillus, but he died (365) before it was built. Concordia was indeed a very abstract Goddess, but characteristically Roman just for that reason, being an idea personified, namely the harmonious co-operation of the hitherto warring elements of the State. Rome may be said to be now internally associated, and is ready to start forward to her career of external association. The Goddess Concordia is henceforth to be worshiped by both Patricians and Plebeians, and will not fail to keep them in view of their reconciliation, which is certain to be often tested.

The Canuleian law (445) legalizing intermarriage (*jus connubii*) of Plebeian and Patrician promoted the social equality of the two Classes more than anything else. Of course there may not have been much intermarriage at first. Especially the patrician ladies would be shy of

such an alliance; they still are. The patrician men, particularly the impoverished, would be the first to break over. The same process we see to-day. The nobleman of Europe, moneyless yet prodigal, will replenish his purse by marrying a rich American heiress, to the infinite disgust of the women of his rank. The statutes of some states prohibited the intermarriage of white and black; the negro had not and socially still has not, a *jus connubii*. The most radical New England humanitarian will draw the line of *jus* at the *connubium*. So we may understand this repeal of the old Roman Patrician limit which allowed the Family to be equalized as well as the Classes.

Here we may call attention to that abbreviation of the Roman City-State or formula of the two Classes (S. P. Q. R.), which must have become common at this time, and remained a kind of seal signifying Republican Rome. We still see it stamped on her monuments in many places. The general meaning of it to the Roman mind is plain: it united in a label or heraldic sign the two elements, the Senate and the People of Rome, implying the dualism but implying it as overcome. We may deem it the trade-mark of the Roman governmental machine. Many interpretations have been given to this Roman monogram (we may also consider it) both in ancient and modern times; especially the letter Q in it has given trouble; but the foregoing was its

sense to the average Roman. The constituents of the republic, Aristos and Demos, are explicitly given, while Monarchos is left out. To be sure one may say (without authority however) that R stands for the suppressed *Rex*, who, present at the start of Rome, is bound to appear at the end (Niebuhr's view is given, Hist. Rom., Vol. I, p. 294, Eng. Translation; Mommsen's view, Hist. Rom., Vol. I, p. 90, Eng. Trans., new edition.)

B. *The outer conflict.* After the expulsion of Tarquin there was a war with the Etruscans, who sought to restore their kindred to the Roman kingdom, and especially to keep Etruscan influence still supreme at Rome. Finally Lars Porsena of Clusium, greatest of the monarchs of Etruria, wins back all the Etruscan territory previously lost to Rome and makes with her a peace which has no restoration of the Kings. Rome seems to have been reduced quite to her original limits and has to begin over again. Pliny has handed down a curious fact: Porsena in token of subjection would not allow to the Romans the use of iron for any other purpose than for farming implements (*ne ferro nisi agri cultu uterentur*). Veii, a near Etruscan city, and the chief rival of Rome, has now the supreme opportunity to make herself the great center of Middle Italy and finally of the World. Why could she not do it?

This entire epoch of 144 years Rome is engaged in petty wars with her petty neighbors. It is a most tedious, patience-consuming account as recorded even in the bright pages of Livy's first decade, or in the more plodding style of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. One gets completely worn down in reading the numberless little frays of the border between Rome on the one side and on the other the Equians and Volscians, Sabines and Latins. In vain we seek the historic value of these frontier squabbles which later national vanity tried to trick out as big wars, with vast numbers slain who seem to come to life again and have to be killed afresh. Still amid this chaos of hundreds of years of petty warfare we may clutch the following main facts.

(1) The neighboring Sabellians—communities and tribes—are trying to seize Rome as their own. The Sabines on the North, with whom the Romans kept up a neighborhood fight for forty years, the Equians and probably the Volscians were of Sabellian blood, of which Rome herself had a portion. These and others of their kin maintained a kind of perpetual running combat with Rome, till at last they get associated with her—which seems to have been the historic object of their long struggle.

(2) The neighboring Latins on the South make war with Rome, which after the battle of

Lake Regillus is concluded by a peace and then by an alliance. But after the Gallic invasion, the Latins again begin to stir against Rome now much weakened, yet are in the end defeated. The Latin is likewise an element, in fact the original element of the Roman community, which in this case also has at last to associate its own ethnic kindred of Latium.

(3) The neighboring Etruscans to the North-West across the Tiber still continue sullen and jealous toward Rome, particularly the large city of Veii, only twelve miles distant. There is no doubt that between these two cities existed the most bitter rivalry far back, seemingly from the foundation of Rome itself. The question had long been: Which shall be the leading city of this central Italic land? But we may well think that there is throbbing unconsciously in both the far deeper question of their future destiny which runs thus: Which of the two is to be the great world-historical city, the mistress not only of Italy, but of the whole Mediterranean territory?

Rome has long known that there cannot be two Romes, particularly so close together. But the time comes when she feels able to destroy her rival, who has for centuries lain so threatening on her flank, ready to pounce upon her in any calamity, and always stirring up lesser communities to war. Now Veii is surrounded with

high Etruscan walls and requires for its capture a siege which lasts ten years (406–396) like the Trojan city. But it is taken by Camillus through a mine, and is utterly wiped out, the men being killed, the women and children being sold into slavery. Still Veii even as empty and deserted gives trouble, for the Plebeians wish to migrate thither and possess the well-built city, and thus establish a dual Rome, Plebeian and Patrician. But this most dangerous move is finally voted down by the Tribes themselves, with a bare majority of one in twenty-one (ten tribes for and eleven against). So associated Rome is once more saved from being broken is twain, and can move forward to its world-historical destiny, which is that of association.

Indeed we may see just in this principle why Rome was the chosen city of the future instead of Veii. The latter lacked the associative character of the former; it had never associated its own separate ethnic elements, for it had only one. There cannot be an Etruscan Rome, though Etruria furnished one of Rome's original elements, as we have seen. Veii, therefore, lacked the required training for the coming world-historical task and so is rejected by the World-Spirit, which now demands associative power, in the City-State. Thus after a rivalry of more than three centuries Veii is annihilated to establish the unity of Rome. The Roman

soldier having to stay at the siege winter and summer, begins to get pay for his service—a regulation of Rome which will bear its fruits. Somewhat later another Etruscan city, Cære, is taken by the Romans, as it lies not far away and seems to have assumed the Veiian rivalry. It is, however, not destroyed, but is allowed to live deprived of all self-administration under a Roman præfect.

Thus on every side Rome was engaged in a petty border warfare with Sabellian, Latin, and Etruscan, seeking to associate them in a small way, while they resisted, trying to preserve their separate autonomous condition. But upon all these little but lively communities pours down from the North the Gallic deluge, obliterates many of them and conquers the rest except a few high-walled towns. Rome is captured in 390, and the people betake themselves to the empty walls of Veii and there reside till Rome is delivered. But again comes up the question: Shall we rebuild the destroyed Rome? Why not stay here in these well-built untenanted houses? Veii though depopulated, once more threatens the destiny of Rome, which, however, overcomes afresh the proposed separation, and makes herself a new Rome, inhabited by a new people whose hitherto separated Classes are soon to be co-ordinated and associated on an equality by the Licinian Rogations.

The Gallic invasion has inculcated a very impressive lesson upon the much-divided tribes and communities of Central Italy. The Gauls have settled in Northern Italy and have largely driven out the Etruscans and the Umbrians (Sabellians) from the Valley of the Po. It is said that the most important Etruscan city of the North, Melpum, situated not far from the later Milan, was surrendered to the Celts on the same day when Veii surrendered to the Romans in the South (396). The need of strong association instead of autonomy or a loose league had been brought home to all these peoples—Etruscans, Sabellians, and Latins—by that deluge of barbarism which might break loose again at any moment. Indeed it kept repeating itself after the first one, and lashing the scattered Italic atoms into Rome's associative power, which could alone protect them.

C. *Great Men.* The famous individuals of this epoch are largely the products of the Heroic Legend, which reflects usually the outer and inner conflicts of Rome. Coriolanus is a valiant but haughty Patrician, equally hostile to the external enemy and to the Plebeians. As a result of the conflict between the Classes, he deserts to the Volscians, with whose aid he is on the point of taking Rome, but is turned back by the prayers of his mother. Cincinnatus was also a Patrician hero who went from his plow to victory over the

Equians, but likewise avenged his insolent son against a Plebeian accuser. Both these stories connect the heroic name of a Patrician with Rome's outer and inner conflicts. It is often said by recent historians of Rome that the legends were songs written in praise of the aristocratic Houses. But a decided limitation is drawn upon the characters of both Coriolanus and Cincinnatus. The sad tale of Dentatus shows wholly a Plebeian sympathy against the Patrician Decemvirs. The impressive story of the father, Virginius, slaying his daughter, Virginia, is anti-Patrician, and is the chief means of bringing about the Valerian law in favor of the plebiscite. One of the last of these legends is that of Camillus, the popular hero against the city of Veii and against the Gauls, yet hostile to the Plebeians, who succeeded in getting him banished. Still he is brought back in a great crisis, and performs wonderful exploits.

Such is, in general, the legendary picture of these great Patricians, who are shown heroic abroad, but quite unheroic at home. They are not the supporters of the new civic development of the Roman City-State now taking place, which is really the work of Plebeian leaders, probably not good subjects for mythical glorification. Still the Roman Legend of the time has drawn a pretty fair picture of the Patrician both in his strength and in his weakness. That the

likenesses are on the whole true to life is shown by the hold which they have taken on mankind. The good and the bad of the proud aristocrat have been limned for all time to the people in these old tales, which have produced a European literature of their own. They are really the products of the collision between the Plebeians and Patricians in the movement toward the equalization of the two Classes, or toward Rome's civic association, as we name it. A genuine mythical product they are surely, hence existent for all time; so it comes that the schoolboy recollects Coriolanus and Cincinnatus and Virginius, when he forgets everything else in Roman History.

The legends of the present time are different from those of the kings who, beginning with Romulus, are chiefly founders, introducers of this or that new institution; they seem almost personifications of Rome's institutional elements, till the last Tarquin tries to change the polity and is expelled. The Roman king differs much from the Roman aristocrat, yet both are pictured in Roman Legend. It may here be added that in the coming epoch the legendary vein begins to run dry, the Licinian law having largely removed the collision between the Classes from which it sprang, and Rome having become more historical than mythical in spirit.

Such is, in general, the second Epoch of the

first Period, in which Rome associates her Classes, being occupied largely with her inner or civic conflict. Having performed this task, she begins to move outward to a new work.

III.

Ethnic Association.

In the last Epoch Rome has attained her civic Association, though the principle is by no means carried out in all the offices and functions of State. The application of the principle of equality is still to be continued, though this is henceforth a subordinate movement of the time. Rome turns her face outward to a new task. She is, as it were, to return to her first work, done in the time of the kings, when she associated the three conjoining ethnic communities—Latin, Sabellian, Etruscan. But now her horizon is much widened: she is to associate not the small ethnic communal units, but total ethnic peoples who are related to her originally. We recollect that she was constituted of the three mentioned ethnic ingredients in the form of communities. But at present she advances to associating her whole kinship—the Latins, the Sabellians, and the Etruscans. This is her great act of Italic association, which embraces what may be called the native peoples of Italy, in contrast with the

recent new-comers—the Celts in the North and the Greeks in the South. This is, then, her Ethnic Association, preparatory to a still greater advance when it is finished. The present Epoch is included in the years between the first Plebeian Consul (366) and the Hellenic conflict with Pyrrhus (281).

At the same time this is but a stage of her larger Self-Association. She reaches out to complete her own self-hood which is connected by ties of kinship with each of the three great Italic peoples. She has done what they could not do: she has shown that they can be associated in spite of national differences, and has given an example of it in herself. The trinal embryo of the Roman City-State is to suck in and to assimilate all its cognate peoples. Then the first grand act of her History, that of Self-Association, will have exhausted its associative material, and will be concluded. City-State she is still, but she has evolved from her tri-communal condition, to being tri-national.

Each of the three nations of Central Italy was full of cities, tribes, and communities, whose spirit was in general autonomous, and hence dissociative. It is this separative character which Rome has now to overcome in all her ethnic kinship, having overcome it in herself. Thus she is the chosen means for the great act of Italic Association. We can see that through

her inner career, having equalized and reconciled her Classes, she is prepared for the larger task.

On the other hand there is an external preparation also, which has come with the events of the epoch. The Gallic invasion had submerged all Central Italy except a few rock-built towns which the barbarous invaders could not reach. Rome fell like the rest. The wave soon receded but then it came again and again. What power is to meet this awful desolation! So great was the enmity between these separate Italic communities, that the weaker one repeatedly invited the barbarians to a fresh devastation. Such a terrible experience had taught these peoples of Central Italy that their present political separation meant their enslavement if not their destruction. Already the Gauls had taken possession of the Valley of the Po, slaughtering or driving out its former inhabitants, both Etruscan and Umbrian (Sabellian). The same fate was impending over Central Italy, unless it could be in some way united against the hordes of invaders. But who can do it? Where is the State which has the inner power and principle able to associate the disunited Italic mass?

As we have seen, Rome alone of them all can fulfill the new requirement of the time. The Plebeians, soon after the burning of their city by the Gauls, vote to return to it from Veii and

to rebuild it, thus putting down a great temptation to separate from the Patricians. To be sure Rome is not chosen by the Italic peoples to associate them, but by herself filled, we may see, with the World-Spirit. All three nations will resist, resist bitterly, in devotion to independence and autonomy. Still there is underneath the opposition a growing conviction of the necessity of union. So it comes that Rome will rapidly conquer in the present crisis the three Italic peoples cognate in blood, but politically disunited. Note that already she is consanguine with them through her original communal association, and also the three peoples, otherwise unconnected become connected in and through Rome.

We shall again trace in the present epoch that germinal process continually recurring in Roman History. There will be the inner and outer Conflicts, which, we must recollect, run parallel through the entire Epoch, and in which the Great Men of the time show their greatness.

A. *Inner Conflict.* This simmers down in intensity, though the Plebeians still have to realize their equality by getting hold of the chief offices of State which have been held by the Patricians. The first Plebeian Dictator has been mentioned, and also the first Plebeian Censor; C. Marcius Rutilus held both positions. The first Plebeian Praetor or Judge belongs to 337, while the Publilian law had re-affirmed the legislative compe-

tency of Tribes (339). The Ogulinan law opens to the Plebeians the Augurate and the Pontificate, or the innermost exclusive offices of Religion which had the power of interfering with political affairs (300). Already the calendar of holy and unholy days (*dies fasti et nefasti*) had been published (304), which initiated the Public into what had been a Patrician mystery. Thus the two Classes have been quite equalized in the offices of State, but this does not mean that their difference has been obliterated; in some respects it is more pronounced than ever. But they co-operate with increased power, being mediated chiefly by the new Senate, which is getting always a fresh current of Plebeian blood.

Still the socio-economic problem remains, dividing Rome again into two Classes, not according to birth or privilege, but according to wealth. The rich and poor now to a large extent take the place of Patricians and Plebeians. Two enactments to limit the rate of interest (to ten per cent in 357, and to five per cent in 347) show the attempts to give relief to the debtor against the capitalist. In 326 slavery for debt is abolished. Several new Tribes are added, extending them far into the surrounding country (thirty-one in 318). A very important effect of such increase is to diminish the influence of the Plebeian Assembly which could not so easily and so often come together at Rome to vote. Appius

Claudius as censor distributes freedmen and the poor of the city among all the Tribes instead of confining them to four—the method hitherto. As a political measure this would give the Plebeian voting power largely to the Roman proletariate. The same Appius conferred more solid benefits upon his city by building the Appian way and the Appian aqueduct. His other scheme in regard to the Tribes was abolished in a few years by the succeeding Censors; the Appian way exists to-day at Rome.

But the distress of the poorer citizens, caused by the long and desperate wars against the three Italic peoples, became very acute toward the end of this epoch and the result was a new Secession, the third and last, this time to Janiculum across the Tiber. A reconciliation is brought about by the Hortensian law which distributed the public lands to the landless, but also re-enacted that the Assembly of the Tribes could make laws valid for the whole people. Thus a social measure turns to a means for gaining a political right, as we often see in Roman History. Economic trouble is supposed to have its seat in an inadequate State, which must, accordingly, be mended. Accordingly to the Plebeians in their Assembly (Tribes) is given the legislative power to help themselves.

It would seem that some of these popular laws easily fell into desuetude or were gradually nullified

by the Patricians after their passage. The Valerian law of appeal (*provocatio*), regarded as a bulwark of Plebeian protection, had to be passed three times from its first enactment in 509 by Valerius Poplicola till 300; each time the proposer was named Valerius. Likewise the law affirming the legal competence of the Assembly of the Tribes had three separate enactments—the Valerio-Horatian—(just after the Decemvirate), the Publilian (after the Latin War) and the Hortensian (after the third secession of the Plebs in 286).

B. *Outer Conflict.* The neighborhood wars of Rome with various tribes and communities of the three Italic peoples continue into this epoch (366–281). After the general leveling of them all through the Gallic invasion, there seem to have been attempts on the part of several Latin cities, especially Tibur and Preneste, to take the place of Rome. Also wars sprang up with several of the Sabellian tribes and towns. Likewise the Etruscans of the city Tarquinii began a campaign against their old rival (358). But gradually these local conflicts grow to be general wars involving the respective peoples, who are now as wholes to be united with Rome. This we have called her Ethnic or Italic Association, which we may look at briefly in its separate stages, according to the peoples composing it.

(1) The Latins had largely fallen off from

Rome after her great calamity caused by the Gallic invasion. But in 358 the league with Latium is restored. It seems, however, that the Latins became dissatisfied with it, and in 340 sent to Rome an embassy demanding that one of the Roman consuls must be a Latin, or there would be war. Such a demand seems to have sprung from the Plebeian success over the Patricians. The proposition must have startled the Romans, for it brought up the question: Shall we associate all these Italian peoples on an equality with ourselves? The Roman answer was No, with the acceptance of war. They at once make peace with the more distant Samnites, for a pressing new problem has arisen at their very door. The Latin allies propose to renew that long conflict for equality which the Plebeians and Patricians had recently settled. But Rome as a whole will remain Patrician to the Latins.

The result is a contest which in Roman History is called the Great Latin War, lasting two years (340-338). It created intense anxiety at Rome, for these Latins had been Roman soldiers and had the same language, customs, institutions; their military weapons, discipline, tactics were alike; it seemed a Civil War. But the outcome was a total defeat of the Latins in the battle of Vesuvius and the rapid subjection of all the Latin cities.

But now rises the far harder problem for the

Romans: What shall be our political relation to these Latin cities, cognate in blood and our next neighbors, as well as our earliest allies? It was evident from their recent conduct that they could not be permitted to retain their league with substantial autonomy of the individual members. The Romans could not leave their central city flanked by an uncertain people within a few miles of their gates. If Rome is going to be the conqueror, even of Italy, Latium must be made secure. What political contrivance, then, will best meet the case?

First is the necessity that all inter-communal ties between these Latin communities be broken, so that they cannot easily conspire and co-operate. The Latins had shown a stronger federative sense than any other Italic people; but just this is what must in some way be met and counteracted. Accordingly Rome takes each Latin town and associates it with and through herself. Every road must go to the central City-State, and thence move outward. So each Latin community must communicate with the other Latin communities, not directly but through Rome. Even the right of intermarriage and of inter-commercial relations was taken away. All had to pass through the Roman alembic. The Latin towns were not isolated, as is sometimes said; rather they were associated in a new way, the Roman. In this

way Rome got to know pretty well what was going on in each Latin town. She saw that the old Latin federative principle must be transcended; otherwise Italy would become Celtic or Carthagenian. It is probable that the most intelligent Latins also felt the danger of the situation, and accepted the Roman solution. At any rate they furnish to Rome many illustrious men, though some Latin towns like Præneste, seem to have remained sullen and jealous of Rome for a long time.

The chief means employed by this new kind of Association should be noted. Rome separated the Latin towns still more by a difference of treatment. Some were at once admitted to full Roman citizenship, were incorporated in Tribes, and voted at their assemblies (Lanuvium, Tusculum, Nomentum). Others were allowed their local self-administration, but no share in the Roman government. Some were deprived of their domains, but left internally autonomous (Tibur and Præneste). A few were completely dismantled and depopulated; the people of Velitræ, a Latin town which had shown deep-seated hostility to Rome, were compelled to leave Latium and settle in Etruria. Others were suffered merely to exist without any part in their own local government, this being put into hands of a Roman præfect. In this way Rome rewarded her Latin friends and hamstrung her

Latin enemies, and also divided them from one another. Still with them all she employs a common principle: no inter-communal Association.

This was certainly a vast new step in Roman development. She seems now for the first time to have become fully conscious of her great political destiny and of the chief means for carrying it out. Hitherto her foreign policy had been fluctuating and uncertain of itself; indeed she had little need of a foreign policy, being engaged chiefly in inner conflicts. But the two Classes are equalized and co-operating harmoniously and powerfully; the City-State can now turn outward and begin to associate other City-States, Tribes, and Nations.

(2) In this same epoch takes place Rome's far longer and more desperate contest with the Sabellians, the most widely scattered and also the bravest of the three Italic peoples. From the Valley of the Po down the Appenines quite to the foot of Italy they are dispersed, incapable of united action. Rome will seize them piece by piece, conquer them and associate them in her way, therein perfoming altogether the most difficult feat of the time, if not of her whole History.

The Sabellians will, like the Latins, show different degrees of readiness to become Roman. It has been already set forth that Rome herself is in part Sabellian as to origin; from her own self streams out a line of gradations in hostility

till the Samnites are reached, the most inveterate foes that Rome ever encountered.

They were the strongest and most determined Italic opponents of the Roman method of Association, the most obstinate adherents of the old Sabellian institutions. In fact Rome never associated them internally, as we see by their fight against her in the time of Sulla and even of Caesar.

Four Samnite Wars are ascribed to the epoch of which we are treating. The first Samnite War (343–1) the Romans stopped hurriedly with a peace in order to settle Latium. The second Samnite War (326–304) was famous for the defeat of a Roman army at the Caudine Forks (321) by a Samnite hero, C. Pontius. Still Rome won in the end after a long struggle of twenty-two years. The same was the result of the Third Samnite War (299–290), though there rises a new Samnite hero, Gellus Egnatius, who seems to have organized a Sabellian confederacy against Rome, and sought to unite the Etruscans and even the Gauls against "the Roman wolf." He made a bold march to the North in order to support his confederates, but they were defeated at the Battle of Sentinum (295) in which Gellus Egnatius perished. Still the war lasted five years longer in Samnium. It shows the Sabellian lack of union that the Sabines, another Sabellian people, began a war of their own with Rome the year of the Samnite peace (290).

Finally a Fourth Samnite War breaks out

(281), which involves Tarentum, and with it the Greek world begins to enter Roman History, and to produce in the same a wholly new period of development.

(3) This same epoch sees Rome associate the entire Etruscan people, who had hitherto resisted her chiefly by single cities. The city of Tarquinii, whose territory originally adjoined that of Veii, tried to withstand the Roman encroachments with some help from a few other Etruscan communities. At last in 311 during the Second Samnite War all Etruria except Arretium were aroused to a common resistance against Rome. But she defeated them at Sutrium, when the Roman general Fabius passed through Ciminian forest to Northern Etruria and subjugated the country (308). War breaks out again in 299, when the Etruscans co-operate with the Samnites. Then they unite with Gauls (the Boii) but are beaten twice (284–2), and their resistance ends.

Peace between Rome and Etruria was made in 280, on favorable terms for the latter, since the former was now occupied with a new enemy, Pyrrhus in Southern Italy. The Etruscan cities probably became free allies of Rome, with internal self-government, yet with more or less prohibition of inter-communal relations. This last was far easier to accomplish in Etruria than in Latium, since the Etruscans were less federative in spirit than the Latins.

In the present epoch Rome's associative principle becomes explicit. We may compare her to the hub of the wheel in which the spokes are all fastened and with which they have to revolve. So the communities, tribes, peoples are deprived of their own interrelations, but must be interrelated through her and her law. It is no wonder that Rome took the arch as expressing herself, as her symbol, and erected it for its own sake to be the sign of her triumph. Each voussoir is not determined through itself but through the common center, toward which they all press and which, therefore, interlocks them together so strongly.

It was in this third epoch especially that the system of Roman colonization was developed, primarily as a means for holding to their allegiance subject cities and peoples. Thus the Roman colony was an instrument of Roman association and reflected in its purpose and character the central city. It was another S. P. Q. R. for its locality. Sena Gallica founded in the country of the Senonian Gauls (282), shows to what use Rome put a colony. Also the colonies were not all alike, but were bound to her by various legal ties. Still they had the common Roman purpose of compelling unassociated Italy to associate, of course with and through Rome, the central City-State.

C. *Great Men.* During this epoch, Rome does not produce any towering individualities.

In fact the Roman government does not foster them. Really the two greatest men of the time were Samnites, Caius Pontius who captured the Roman army with both consuls at the Caudine Forks, and Gellus Egnatius who led his forces across the Roman lines for the purpose of combining with the North Italic peoples and also with the Gauls against Rome. His idea and his action were great, he was the Samnite Hannibal. But he came too late to save his cause. And how can he unite those whose principle is disunion? Rome is doing the work of association, seemingly in the only way in which it can be done.

The form in which Great Men appear in Rome at present is that of an assembly of the Senate. They too are associated, they work not individually but collectively. There is a selection of the best for the Senate, according to talent and experience, not by birth and privilege. Plebeian and Patrician can both be Senators, who also have a life-tenure, while the Consul holds office for a year. Rome still has a jealousy of the individual in power, who must be absorbed into the Senate, and go into authority through the Senate. Rome has become a Senatorial State, having evolved out of a Patrician State. The assembly of the Plebeians has done its chief work in developing men gifted with leadership for Senators. Rome, we repeat, is jealous and intolerant of the individual who seeks greatness or

popularity directly through himself and not through the avenues of the State. Here lies the ultimate ground for the fate of Spurius Cassius, Spurius Mælius, and Titus Manlius, all of whom were important individuals who were put to death on the charge of seeking the kingship, or personal supremacy. Demos has gotten indeed his rights, but his ultimate right is to sift out his best man for the Senate, which was once strikingly described as "an assembly of Kings." Not one but many monarchs are there in a single body.

So we are to see in the Senate, as it has unfolded, a true form of associated Rome, in fact the highest, for it now associates the best talents for its government. It is this new associated Senate which has, true to its character, put down dissociated Italy, and has very skillfully elaborated the means for unifying it with itself. An ever-flowing fountain of the best ability wells up from the Roman people as a whole into the Senate to which the individual must first give himself in order to receive back his meed of value for his country.

We are often told that these Italic cities and nations which Rome subdued and associated, lost their most precious boon, their freedom. It is worth while to note what advantages they received by way of compensation. (1) They obtained security against the destructive inundations of the Gallic barbarians, ever threatening from the North, like Fate; (2) they obtained

security from neighborhood wars which had to go to Rome for adjustment; (3) they obtained security against inner revolutions arising through political parties in the city. On the other hand they lost their autonomy, to be sure in various gradations, for even over her allies Rome was supreme. Here the question comes up: Which represents the higher principle before the tribunal of the World's History, the Samnite or the Roman? We have already seen autonomy run its world-historical course in Greece, which it did not and could keep free. Nor can it, being dissociative and centrifugal, give permanent liberty to Italy against external domination. Nothing is plainer at this time than that the Italic peoples must be Gallicized, that is, barbarized, or Romanized. Certainly Samnium, with its separative condition and consciousness could not have saved Italy nor itself.

Athens, in the most glorious period of her History, felt the limitation of autonomy and tried to associate the Greek cities against the destiny hanging over them from the outside—from Persia and then from Macedon. But Athens could not succeed, could not conquer the dualism in herself, for she too was in her character the autonomous Greek City-State. Italy had the same external destiny suspended over her from the Alps and beyond, and she was, like Greece, full of independent City-States, Tribes and Peoples, into which the original Italo-Greek racial proto-

plasm had unfolded in both peninsulas. But Rome has developed the associative gift within herself as we have traced it.

Rome has, therefore, the right of the World-Spirit in subordinating these autonomous atoms to a higher end which is really a higher freedom. Many a sigh has been heaved for the untoward loss of Samnite freedom; even Mommsen, rather absolutistic as we read him, can fetch a little suspiration on the subject. But Rome just here is fulfilling her world-historical task with an untold outlay of effort; she is obeying the decree of the World-Spirit, and from this point of view she is to be judged at last.

The long First Period of Roman History which we have called Self-Association, has now come to an end. Its three Epochs (or sub-periods) have been considered; each of them has been seen to have its own process, which, however, is the germinal one, and hence is common to them all. The first Epoch, or communal association with its three ethnic Village-Communities, has been rounded out by the third Epoch, or ethnic association with its three consanguine Peoples—consanguine with Rome through her primal associative act. Rome has now associated her complete Self, overarching and embracing her Italic kinship, which through her has become inter-related. Such we may well deem her first great historic cycle or Period, which has prepared her for the next, now at hand.

Section Second.

Rome Associates the World.

In the preceding Period Rome has essentially finished the work of Self-Association which has reached out and incorporated her constitutive peoples—Latin, Sabellian, and Etruscan. Undoubtedly their assimilization is not yet finished and will not be for several generations. Many of their communities and tribes are still quivering with revenge, and awaiting a chance to strike for their lost autonomy. Pyrrhus and Hannibal will give them such a chance, which, however, will not avail. Rome's Italic Association is a fact accomplished, not to be undone for centuries. The result is a border even in Italy between Italic and non-Italic peoples, the latter being the Celts in the North (Valley of the Po) and the Greeks in the South (Magna Græcia). The question came up to every Roman mind looking from the central city: Shall we now start associating these non-Italic peoples on the soil of our Italy? They were aliens in blood and institutions, and they furnished no original communal element to form Rome.

We can well conceive that conservative Romans would have preferred to stand guard on the Rim and to keep what they had won. But it was

soon found that Rome could not stop in her career of association, or of conquest if you please. In the North both Etruscans and Sabellians have repeatedly called in the Celts against Rome. The battles at Sentinum and the Vadimonian Lake, not to speak of the earlier Gallic deluges, show that there can be no lasting security in Italy till these Celts also be Romanized and thus civilized. To be sure the problem keeps pushing beyond Italy to Gaul itself—but the record of that belongs to a later time.

Even more intimately are the Italic peoples of Lower Italy bound up with the Greek cities of that locality, which have not only traded with them but have imparted to them somewhat of Greek culture. Moreover, Sicily belongs physically to Italy, and in that large and fertile island alongside the Greek a wholly different race has effected lodgment, the Semitic represented in Carthage. On this side also the Italic Rim seems to extend indefinitely, if Rome intends to hold in security what she has won.

But the important fact which marks the Period is that Rome comes into immediate contact with Greek civilization, and has to associate the developed Greek City-State. That is truly her new political problem, very different from her Italic one, though both be associative. Tarentum, autonomous, democratic, nautical, commercially prosperous, is in a number of respects an

Occidental Athens, which Rome has to meet and subordinate, though still a barbarian compared to the Greek, who in his turn will have to overcome her barbarism with his culture.

Rome is already the political people supremely and is prepared for her Greek task of Association, which is to universalize the City-State, this being in Greece particular. We have seen that the Greek City-State was totally unable to associate the Greek people as a whole, or the Greek tribes, or even the separate Greek communities. On the contrary Rome's History shows her associating diverse Italic communities, Italic tribes, and finally the three Italic peoples. Politically Rome is the positive counterpart of Hellas, doing what the latter left undone. The History of Greece is the record of the failure of the Greek City-State as head to associate the Greek City-State as member. Athens, Sparta, Thebes tried it in succession, with their three different headships or hegemonies. After some success, all failed sooner or later (see preceding, pp. 286, *et seq.*). They could not associate community, tribe, nation—could not do just what Rome has done. So she has now to pick up their task left undone, and to associate, first of all this Greek City-State, which, however, on the cultural side has done what political Rome will never be able to do. When, therefore, open war is declared in 281 B. C. between Rome and Tarentum, the

two kinds of ancient City-States, the Roman and the Hellenic, are pitted directly against each other. The latter is just passing out of its world-historical stage, the former is just coming into the same, supplanting the Greek.

Tarentum at this time was doubtless the greatest autonomous City-State of the Hellenic world. The former free communities of Greece had fallen under the sway of the Macedonian, and were in a decline. Syracuse in Sicily, which was the only Greek city of the present age comparable with Tarentum, was dominated by a tyrant within and threatened by Carthage without. Tarentum cultivated her navy, but on land she hired mercenaries to do her fighting and bribed peoples by her subsidies. She has been aware for many years that Rome was her coming danger. Her diplomacy was to stir up and keep alive the hatred of the Italic peoples against Rome; the Samnites and the Celts she had supported with her money. During the whole time of Rome's Italic association (366–281), when she, having harmonized her Classes, broke away from the petty wars with town and tribe near-by, and began to subdue the entire three Italic peoples, Tarentum was at work among them with secret instigation and bribery. This Rome well knew, but was very loth to go to war with Tarentum, feeling the difficulty of the new task, not so much of war as of association after war.

Indirectly Rome had long had relations with the Greeks, being founded co-temporaneously with the great colonial movement of Greece to the West. As far as can be ascertained, both Tarentum and Syracuse arose about the same time as Rome. The legislation of Numa is often thought to have had some of its inspiration from Greece. The later Decemvirate patterned confessedly after the laws of Solon and of Athens. The Greeks of Cumæ are reported to have stopped the victorious southward career of the Etruscans at Aricia in 506, after the latter had conquered Rome and Latium. During the next hundred and fifty years Rome was going through her internal struggles and was almost wholly self-occupied. Meanwhile the Greeks had passed the bloom of their History, having defeated Persia in Hellas, and Carthage in Sicily, and then having gradually undone themselves. Of this historic Greek phenomenon Rome must have known something, perhaps not very much, being outside the stream of the World's History. But at the end of Rome's Ethnic or Italic Association, Tarentum, being thoroughly frightened, calls in Pyrrhus from the Greek peninsula against the Romans, who thus are thrown into conflict with a new part of the Greek world.

Here we may note that there are three territorial stages of Hellas, or the three Hellases existent in space—Middle, Occidental and Oriental. It

is Occidental Hellas, embracing the Greek City-States of Sicily and Italy, with which the Romans came into contact first, and which are still autonomous in part. Middle and Oriental Hellas is Macedonian at the present time, being ruled by the successors of Alexander the Great. We shall see that Rome has gradually to move toward the three Hellases and associate them all. Indeed it is this act which makes Rome world-historical, makes her the political heir of the Greek City-State, whose autonomy is to be taken up into Roman supremacy and somehow digested.

The effort, however will compel Rome to employ a new political device, that of proconsular authority over a given territory called the Province. This, after various approaches, happens fully in Sicily with its clusters of Greek City-States. It is a one-man power and thus is contradictory to the previous Roman principle of Association. The Roman individual now becomes in the Province a kind of king for the purpose of holding together those recalcitrant self-sufficing Greek communal atoms under the one central City-State. This pro-consular Governor is usually a Senator and is responsible to the Senate, which therein begins to break up into a body of individual rulers or monarchs. What Macedonian Philip did with the Greek City-State through himself alone, the Roman Senate now does with it, but sends forth a multi-

plicity of Philips, and thus divides up into a manifoldness of separate satraps, who, first sent out from Rome, will at last be seen marching back to Rome. Mark the change. Previously in Central Italy Rome had expanded simply her own original ingredients or formative stuffs—Latin, Sabellian, and Etruscan. She was hardly called upon to meet any new problem of associating peoples and institutions beyond what she had already done in associating her own communal constituents. When she had completed her Italic Association, she was little more than a quantitative increase and a spatial enlargement of her original self. But the Greek City-State is qualitatively different from these communal elements of Rome; it is fully developed, even aging; it is highly civilized, with a contempt for the barbarian, who may be stronger; it has an ingrained consciousness of autonomy, crystallized, no longer formative. Thus it has to be associated from the outside, by one will, such as the Greek tyrant, or the Roman proconsul with his *imperium* (which word even suggests the beginning of the empire).

Very notable, therefore, is the wrench which was given to the Roman principle in order to associate the Greek political fabric. It really dualizes the hitherto united Rome, causing her to have two different, yea opposite sorts of Association—the one through herself directly (Italic),

the other through an individual endowed with practically absolute authority (Provincial). This is the fundamental fact of the second Period, now starting, of the Roman Republic, which makes its Association separative, dual, in meeting the new problem brought to the front by the Greek world.

Rome's political gifts to the Hellenistic or civilized East and to the barbarous West were different. To the Greek world she gave the power of uniting itself, which it had never had, of forming the Empire City-State, such as Rome herself became. So the latter imparted her own self, her imperial political consciousness to the Greek. This is what Constantine could build on after the nation had had more than 400 years of training. For he did not found a Macedonian or Tribal Empire over the Hellenistic World, but a new City-State as imperial for the first time. What Athens for instance could not do, he did. In fact Rome herself was undone as imperial City-State when this was accomplished, and it soon after went down. So the Roman Empire from Augustus had as its end to give itself to Greece and the East. At any rate the World-Spirit brought this about.

On the other hand Rome gave to the West through the Teutonic peoples the new Nation-State which has gradually possessed Europe.

This second Period of Roman History in which

Rome associates the World we place between the War with Pyrrhus and the destruction of Spanish Numantia (281-133). In this latter year also (133) Sempronius Gracchus begins his work which starts a new Period of the inner History of Rome, the third.

In the present, or second Period of Roman History we see Rome applying her policy already described. She deprives communities of inter-communal relations, tribes of inter-tribal relations, cities of inter-urban relations, nations of inter-national relations. All forms of goverment must come to her as center, and be associated through her with one another. If they lose their autonomy, they are getting in return universal association; they become united through Rome with all peoples. Thus they are put under training to the world-historical discipline of the age. In this Period she monopolizes association, and she will allow no rival in the same business. She makes the world her Plebeians now, as her own civic Plebeians are associated on an equality with the Patricians, and in the old sense no longer exist inside the city. Still this new set of Plebeians, the outside World, will likewise struggle for and finally reach equalization. But such a movement hardly belongs to the Period before us, which is to show (1) Italy associated, (2) Association assailed by Hannibal, (3) Mediterranean Association.

I.

Italy Associated

Rome is now seen associating the non-Italic peoples in Italy, the Greeks and Celts. Moreover Sicily as a part of Italy physically, is to be connected with her politically. But this brings upon the stage of History the third non-Italic, yea non-Aryan people, the Carthaginians, whose city is located in Africa. The latter have been waging a long and desperate conflict with the Occidental Greeks for the possession of Sicily. It is this conflict which Rome, having subdued many of the western Greeks, has to take off their hands. and continue it till all Sicily becomes hers.

As usual, we shall trace in this epoch of associated Italy the germinal historic process of Rome with her inner and outer conflicts, as well as their mediation through the individual, either as person or as the whole City making itself personal and active. This we designate as the A. B. C, movement, being in our exposition the ultimate or embryonic process of Roman History (see foregoing p. 435-6).

A. *Inner conflict.* During this entire first epoch of the Second Period which lasts over sixty years, from the Pyrrhic war till the Hannibalic, there is hardly any inner history

of Rome. The two Classes co-operate harmoniously to the one great end of the Roman State, which is the complete Association of Italy; the government runs on mightily but without friction, making the contrast with the preceding epoch most notable. Hardly worth recording is the fact that the first Plebeian Pontifex Maximus, the highest religious position at Rome, was installed in 252. This seems to have been the last Patrician fortress to yield to the already triumphant equality of the Classes. The Roman constitution is certainly now marching, irresistible but quite noiseless internally.

The only event which stirred up a reminder of the old troubles was an agrarian law of the Tribune Flaminius, which divided the conquered territory of the Senonian Gauls among the poor citizens who were landless. The historian Polybius condemns this act as demagogic, and as "the beginning of the people's deterioration" (II. 21). This was in 232, a century before Gracchus. But we have seen that agrarian laws were proposed long before this one, so that Polybius in such an opinion seems to have echoed the aristocratic prejudices of his Roman environment while writing his history.

B. *Outer Conflict.* Rome, internally quiet, is very busy abroad with the more recent non-Italic intruders upon the soil of Italy (Sicily included). She proceeds to associate all peoples within its

territorial limits as laid down by nature. This Roman consciousness, now fully arisen, receives emphatic utterance in the answer of defeated Rome to Pyrrhus after the battle of Heraclea: no negotiation with foreign troops on Italic soil. To be sure, the limits of Italy to the Roman mind at that time may not have included Sicily or even the Po Valley, but the uncertainty will clear up rapidly during the present epoch, which will show Rome running her boundary line around Italy quite as it exists to-day.

In the epochal 63 years (281–218) before us, we shall see Rome making three great strides in succession, each of which is accompanied with heavy conflicts against the peoples occupying the given territories. These conflicts are (1) with the Greeks and their allies headed by Pyrrhus, in the South; (2) with the Carthaginians on sea and land for the possession of Sicily; (3) with the Celts in the North for the possession of the Po Valley. Each of these great Roman strides deserves a little consideration by itself even in the briefest summary.

(1) Tarentum which invited Pyrrhus over to Italy in 281, had ere this done the same thing several times. Moreover the rise of Philip and Alexander had danced a similar ambitious dream, whose field, however, was to be in the West, before the imaginations of various Greek and semi-Greek rulers. Archidamus of Sparta had

come over, but was defeated and slain by the Lucanians in 338 on the day of the battle of Chæroneia, where he ought to have been with the other Greek patriots fighting against Philip. Alexander the Molossian, uncle of Alexander the Great, crossed the Adriatic at the call of Tarentum and won victories, but perished (332), while his all-renowned nephew was sweeping triumphantly through West-Asia. And now Pyrrhus has appeared, by Tarentine invitation, with his semi-barbarous but well-disciplined Epirot soldiery, and very distinctly proposes to enact anew the grand career of the great Alexander in the West. Himself a brilliant but unstable genius, he has to deal with the most obstinate foe that ever stood in battle-line. As to the Italic Greeks he promises them autonomy, but intends no such thing: a perfidious policy which he has learned from the Macedonian tyrants in Greece and in the East. At once he puts the populace of Tarentum under strict military rule, to its great disappointment and even terror.

In the first battle with Pyrrhus (Heraclea, 280 B. C.) the Romans were defeated, mainly by the elephants which they had not before encountered. Pyrrhus offered terms: grant autonomy to the Greco-Italic cities, and to the various Southern Italic tribes and peoples. This meant that the Romans should give up their association of Italy— which they refused on the spot. Of course

Pyrrhus intended to make himself monarch of these autonomous members and establish a Macedonian empire in the West. A second battle was fought at Asculum (279), with victory again for Pyrrhus, at which he is reported by Plutarch to have said: One more such victory and we are lost. Pyrrhus then passes over to Sicily, where he had at first success, but final failure. He returns to Italy, fights his last battle with the Romans who defeat him this time (Beneventum 276), whereupon he quits Italy for home.

Thus Pyrrhus could not engraft a Macedonian empire upon the West. He could not do with Rome what Alexander had done with Persia. The world-historical movement was going the other way; Rome was not to be Macedonized, but Macedon in the end was to be Romanized, politically. The Macedonian phalanx was driven out at last by the Roman legion. Pyrrhus assailed Roman association, which, however, showed that it could associate him and the Hellenic world. Really he did not know what he attacked. He thought the Roman fabric would tumble asunder at his blow, as Greece did, into its autonomous atoms, over which he could easily make himself the autocrat. But he could not re-enact in Italy the part of Philip in Greece. Still his idea of realizing a new Macedonian Hellas in the West makes him a very interesting and suggestive character, whose failure was prophetic.

Milo, the general left by Pyrrhus, surrendered Tarentum in 272 to the Romans and not to the Carthaginians, whose ships were in the harbor to take it. So Carthage did not get a foothold in Italy. Brundusium became a Roman colony as a rival to Tarentum.

But now comes a new element. These Greeks were mariners, and Rome was not. A Roman fleet was now possible, indeed necessary. The inner struggle of Rome and her distance from the seacoast had caused the Roman navy to decline (lowest about 350). But the need of associating Greek cities caused the navy to rise slowly. Rome began to interest herself in naval matters. Latium had the best timber for shipbuilding. The struggle with Carthage, a great maritime powér, was felt to be approaching.

The contact of Rome with the Greek City-States of South Italy was the first step in her passing from an Italian or domestic career to a world-historical or Mediterranean career. For they connected with the Greek cities of Sicily, which were then in a struggle with Carthage and whelmed Rome soon into their conflict, which had been going on 300 years, and which the Roman solves by swallowing both Greek and Semite. In another direction the Greek cities led across the sea to Greece, and still further to the Greek empire of Alexander's Successors, which was then the great fact of the World's History. Greek

civilization, having developed itself to its fullness moves East and is Hellenizing the Orient. Moreover Carthage will compel a West-Mediterranean movement of Rome to Spain, and indeed to Africa.

Thus Rome truly begins her world-historical destiny with these Greek cities; she is to show herself the successor of Greece in the grand historic succession. The World-Spirit hitherto working in her implicitly becomes now explicit, leaves Greece and the East and starts for Rome, whose function in the present direction is to associate dissociated Hellas. We have already noted this contrast (among others) between the two great nations of antiquity: The Greek people have unity in Religion, but not in the State, while Rome has her unity in the State, but not in Religion, which is to subserve the ends of the State. Through Rome Hellas is to attain political association, of which the beginning has now distinctly appeared.

(2) Rome is now to take her next great stride toward the association of the Greco-Italic world by stepping over the Straits of Messina and getting possession of Sicily, This, however, is no small task. The Greek and the Carthaginian have long been struggling for the fair island—three centuries and more. Carthage was getting the upper hand and held numerous Greek cities; her chief antagonist, Syracuse, was on the wane.

Thus the Roman inherited the Greek conflict with the Semite, and after a long and fluctuating conflict drove him wholly out of the island. This conflict is known as the First Punic War (264–241), in which Rome has also to become a sea-power, rather unwillingly.

Carthage, with which Rome has now seriously to reckon, is also a City-State but of Phœnician origin, devoted to commerce wholly. Its instrument was the sea, which it deemed its own in the West and would destroy any mariner poaching upon its domain. No record of its own deeds it has left, we learn of it through its enemies. It did not impart what it had—civilization, government, wealth. Its colonies were chiefly factories, not reproductions of itself, as were the Greek. It had no citizen soldiery like Rome, but mainly mercenaries. Its agricultural work was done by slaves; it had no class like the independent Roman farmer. Carthage was an aristocracy, but confined to a few best families; into its governing class there was no rise of the competent from below. Its subject cities and peoples had no share in the government, no commercial rights.

Compared to the Greek City-State which it met and wrestled with in Sicily, Carthage had no idea of autonomy except for itself. Compared to the Roman City-State with which it is now to grapple, Carthage did not associate even

its kindred. All had to come under the one autocratic will, without any degrees of association. Hence Carthaginian subjects were always ready to revolt. The appearance of an enemy in Africa never failed to produce a dissolution of authority outside the walls of Carthage. The City-States of Sicily, especially Syracuse, had a tendency to beget tyrants, some of whom were great rulers, as Dionysius, Agathocles, even Timoleon, the best of them all. This tendency seems to have been born of the Carthaginian conflict ever lowering over them, which called up the strong man.

Carthage, like its parent, the Phœnician City-State, was the middleman in commerce, who grasped for all profits to the full. That seems to have been her ultimate end, so she had no need or desire for self-expression in art, literature, or history, like the Greek. Nor did she develop law and the State like the Roman. Her political organism, as well as her career, rested upon making an end of that which can only be a means, and of reducing to a means that which ought to be the end. She interchanged the spheres of commerce and the State. Still she was an improvement upon old Phœnicia, and showed a much stronger character. Seemingly she was on the point of getting control of the Greek Occident, both in Sicily and Italy when the Roman appeared. Significant is the fact

that a Carthaginian fleet of war entered the harbor of Tarentum, just as the city was passing into the hands of the Romans, who had a treaty with Carthage during the war with Pyrrhus, their common enemy.

The First Punic War ends in the acquisition of Sicily by the Romans, who now have the new problem of governing a land which is full of Greek City-States, civilized, despising their conquerors as barbarians, and still aspiring for autonomy. It was at this time (just after the First Punic War) and under this emergency that Rome began the system of Provinces, already alluded to, which had such an influence upon Roman History and Roman character. Greece was like a lot of pellets which have to be kept together in a box. Sicily as island is a kind of natural box for holding its atomic City-States, and so made a natural province or group for the Romans, who repeated it often afterwards. To Italy proper the provincial system was not applied. Rome remained the imperial center (S. P. Q. R.). But the Province was governed by a person as autocrat sent from the Senate; the Greek-City has had such an outcome in the Macedonian monarch, whom to a certain extent Rome now copies. Him, represented in Pyrrhus, Italy has rejected, while Greece has accepted him. So Rome associates the Hellenic world by provincializing it through a monarch of her own,

who is a governor with pro-consular authority. In this way she begins to ray out into many monarchs from her central sun. A great historic result this policy will have not only upon the character of Rome, but of the World.

(3) In the time between the First and Second Punic Wars (241–218), Northern Italy is secured to Rome. The Gallic peoples of the Po Valley invade Etruria with a large army in 225, but are completely overthrown at the battle of Telamon. Other victories were won by the Romans who ended the war four years later by taking Mediolanum (Milan), the chief Gallic city, and then by planting in 218 the military colonies, Cremona and Placentia, on opposite sides of the Po for keeping watch over the country, which was some years afterwards made into a Roman Province and known as Cisalpine Gaul.

Thus the Romans have quite completed the round of Italy, having added the Lower and the Upper to the Central portion. To the native Italic peoples two foreign ones have been joined —Celtic and Greek, uncivilized and civilized, the one Northern and the other Southern—Rome being the connecting link between the two. Moreover they have evoked a new, non-Italic method of government, the Provincial.

The Celts connect Italy with Gaul beyond the Alps, whose peoples they have called to their aid, and even with Spain beyond the Pyrenees.

The ethnic protoplasm of the vast Celtic stock is spread far to the West and North-West of Italy, even into the British isles; the time has come when it is to be dipped into Roman civilization, and thus pass out of barbarism. It is a long, hard task for Rome, yet laid upon her by the World-Spirit, and fulfilled chiefly by her greatest son, Julius Cæsar. Thus Rome in the present epoch has begun to move from her central peninsular position toward the West and the Atlantic.

But she has at the same time begun to move toward the East which embraces for her the Hellenic peninsula and West Asia. The Western or Italic Greek she has associated in this epoch; the Hellenic Greek she has begun to deal with, having sent an embassy to Athens and Corinth in 228. Greek commerce she has helped by her suppression of the Illyrian pirates and their Queen Teuta. Even the Hellenistic Greek in the Orient is beginning to pay attention to the new power on the Tiber which has driven out Pyrrhus, humbled Carthage, and conquered the Greek Occident.

C. *Great Men.* The most striking individuals in Roman History of this epoch are non-Romans — the Hellenized Epirot Pyrrhus, and the Carthaginian Hamilcar Barcas, who almost single-handed defied the Romans in Sicily till their final naval victory, which was won through

no fault of his. But to him was allotted the melancholy duty of surrendering the island to the Romans, after his countrymen had fought for it and held parts of it hundreds of years. We shall soon see him in Spain organizing a new army for assailing Rome. To him probably belongs the plan carried out by his son Hannibal, the plan of invading Italy by crossing the Alps from the Spanish peninsula.

Not only no Roman Great Man appears, but there is a marked absence of talent in the commanders. The Roman Senate shows strong determination, still in the latter part of the War with Carthage it gives up. Then the Roman community as a whole steps forward, furnishes money, and builds a new fleet which wins the final victory. Behind the Senate rises a stronger association, the People. It is whole Rome which acts as one Great Man, while the other Great Man as individual is not prominent in his own right, being submerged in the associated totality. What colossal strength of association does not Rome show, having first associated herself! The last triumphant act of the First Punic War (known as the battle of the Aegatian Islands) brings before us the real giant in action, whom we have named associated Rome, sweeping to victory almost without leaders, certainly without great ones.

Thus Rome, quite in *propria persona*, winds

up the epoch with a world-historical deed which gains Sicily and completes her association of Occidental Hellas. But she with her principle is soon to be put to the hardest trial of her power, the mightiest individual is to assail her in her very soul, seeking to tear up by the roots her associative work.

II.

Association Assailed.

The association of Italy, which Rome has practically completed, though by no means yet finished, is now to be put to the severest test which human genius can contrive. Or we may look at the matter thus: the World-Spirit, as the supreme historical artificer having modeled and molded this new associative City-State of Rome, is going to fling it into the hottest furnace of war, in order to harden and to make it wear a long time, till its full task be accomplished. The Roman principle of association, still young and not yet ingrown in the institutional tissue of the non-Italic peoples of Italy (Celts and Greeks), and of some of the more stubborn Italic peoples (like the Samnites), is to be smitten by a blow that for a time shivers it, throwing it back more than a century.

Such is, in general, the meaning of what is known in Roman History as the Second Punic

War, or better, the Hannibalic War, for it circles about one great personality. Hannibal, the Carthaginian commander is its hero, and it may well be named after him, as Polybius and some Roman Historians do. His own country never produced anybody like him except his father, Hamilcar Barcas; no Roman, certainly not Scipio, approached him in genius. Still Rome in the end showed itself greater than he; no Roman individual could compare with him for a moment, but all the Romans associated together were the mightier fact of History. Hannibal did his work really without much support from Carthage, which had been undone in First Punic War. The conflict was the Individual against Association, particularly of the Roman kind.

The Hannibalic War we put by itself and name by itself, as a unique occurrence in Roman, yea in Universal History. Beginning with the hero's march from Spain and the invasion of Italy, it lasted about seventeen years (218–202 B. C.). The assault came from the West and from the third North-Mediterranean peninsula (Spanish) which Hannibal and his father had organized and in their way associated for the purpose of throwing it against the second peninsula (Italic), and possibly of making it (Spain) the future seat of empire and the bearer of European civilization. This war, then, was a contest not merely of Rome and Carthage, but of the two

peninsulas for the possession of the coming inheritance. It is truly the central tract of Roman History—these seventeen years of war; Rome turns round upon it as upon a pivot, and becomes truly world-historical, for it compels her to take Spain and Africa and even Greece, since from all these lands Hannibal set in motion powers hostile to her associative principle. It is Hannibal who compels Rome to be universal, to pass from her Italic to her Mediterranean career, which is as near to universality as she ever reached. The Roman Republic has a new consciousness of her destiny when Hannibal is done with her: She knows she is to universalize Association, as far as this could take place in antiquity. Note then that we put the Hannibalic War in the very heart of the process of Roman History, ordering it in the middle of the middle period of this as a whole. Moreover the epoch is entirely made of war, being the mighty struggle of the conflicting principles.

And here the question rises: Can Hannibal succeed? Ought he to succeed? Let the final deepest fact of him be stated distinctly at the start: Hannibal fought against the World-Spirit. A Titan he was, who pitted himself against the Movement of History, against the Genius of Civilization, against the Development of Man toward the State universal. Did he have any intimation or secret premonition of his

standing before the Tribunal of the World's History? We, looking back through a perspective of more than twenty centuries, can see that Rome was the true bearer of humanity toward its goal of institutional freedom. To be sure she was but a stage, a phase often inhuman enough; many a failing in her spirit and in her work can be pointed out; still she represented the new association of the world which Hannibal assailed.

What was Hannibal's object? Primarily he would reduce Italy back to its previous condition of separation; in many a proclamation he declared he would restore each city, tribe, people to its original freedom, as he and they called it. To the Italic Greeks he promised their dear autonomy, of course, as Pyrrhus had done and all the Macedonian tyrants. Everywhere he would undo Roman Association and resolve it again into its atoms, which Rome had so strongly compounded into one common country and its political organization. So far Hannibal's purpose was negative, and we must call his career a negation. Such a character he maintained, probably had to maintain, till the end of his invasion.

But did he not have a further and deeper purpose? Did he not intend to re-unite these Italic atoms in his own way, and according to his Carthaginian principle of association? There can be little doubt of it. The Italic towns which

resisted him he took by force, the party which opposed him he put down, often bloodily. Everywhere he showed himself the over-lord; Italic freedom was but a means with him for a Hannibalic supremacy, which meant, if not a Carthaginian, at least a Semitic control of the destinies of Italy and of Europe. To be sure he kept carefully concealed any such intention; still many Italic communities could not help feeling it and refused to be enfranchised in that way. Institutionally Hannibal must have represented Carthage, which was essentially the Phœnician City-State of the Orient. To it both Greek and Italian had a commercial as well as a racial antipathy, which Hannibal might at first overcome, but could not wholly conquer. As long as he dissolved the Roman bond and gave autonomy, his nation and race were forgotten in his victories; but when he began to organize and subordinate to himself and to Carthaginian leadership his Italic allies, his troubles began, and his triumphs gradually ceased. The Greek City-States of Sicily had fought Carthage hundreds of years, it went against the grain for them to be united under a Carthaginian leader, or even to be united at all. When Hannibal's positive work began to appear, he began to fail. How could it be otherwise? The Greek City-State of Hellas had already transcended and supplanted the old Phœnician City-State many ages since.

And the Roman City-State had already begun to transcend and associate the Greek City-State in the West. How can Greek and Roman be thrown back to Phœnicia? Yet in his positive institutional work Hannibal must have planned some such reversion, turning back the wheels of Time out of Europe to the Orient. Hence we have to consider his career as essentially negative; his was another of those furious Oriental attacks upon European civilization, which he regarded with racial hostility. Still Hannibal was a transcendent genius, verily the greatest military genius whom the Semitic race has produced with all its Mohammedan conquerors. In striking contrast he stands with the mediocrity of the Roman commanders, whose chief strategy consisted, till Scipio appeared, in avoiding a pitched battle with a genius. That was certainly the highest recognition from his foe.

We have to say, then, that Hannibal, like Napoleon, was in the main a mighty negative force, which the World- Spirit at times employs for its supreme end. In so far as he was positive, he sought to restore a transcended form of the institutional world, perchance to Orientalize Europe. Such a scheme, of course, went to pieces in his hands; he, with all his genius, could not quite make Europe undo Europe; he could not Semitize the Aryan stock in the matter of political institutions. Still he performed a great

world-historical function unconscious and unintended by him, for he forced Rome out of her Italic limits into her greater Mediterranean destiny.

So in the supreme glance of thought, we have to regard Hannibal as self-undoing; like all negative men however great, he at last negates himself. That oath of eternal enmity to Rome ended in the destruction of Carthage. The attempt to destroy the associative City-State destroyed the destroyer. Very wonderful is the round of Hannibal's career, going forth from his native city at the age of nine years and kindling in Spain a trail of fire which sweeps over the Alps into the Italic peninsula, and blazes its way down the whole length of the same till the sea, when it crosses back to Carthage and there burns itself out. Much has it consumed in its fiery circle, chiefly itself. Associative Rome, however, is not consumed, though the whole conflagration rages around it up to its very gates.

In like manner Greece withstood the attempt of the Orient, in the Persian War, to destroy its principle of autonomy. We may also say that Rome in the Hannibalic War withstands the attempt of the Orient to destroy its principle of association. It is another phase of the ever-recurring collision between the two great stages of the World's History, the East and the West. Moreover Rome has shown that she can put down

and in her way associate the Orient—a phase of her career which is soon to manifest itself.

So we seek to put into its proper place the unique conflict with Hannibal, making it the middle epoch of the middle period of the History of the Roman republic. But this epoch has also its A. B. C. process, with the decided stress upon the B, since Rome is fighting for dear life with her gigantic external foe.

A. *Inner Conflict.* Italy has been associated through the co-operation of the two Classes, Plebeians and Patricians. But the difference between them still exists; equalized they may be, still the two streams remain more or less separate. This is shown by the fact that both consuls elected in 215, the year after the battle of Cannæ, were Plebeians and probably the best generals in the Roman army (Sempronius Gracchus and M. Marcellus). But the Patricians would not allow such a superiority, and succeeded in setting aside one of the consuls. Moreover we hear of other bickerings between the Classes, particularly in reference to old Fabius and his policy. Even the charge was bruited about that the Plebeians wished well to Hannibal. Certainly his genius was acknowledged in the most practical way by the Fabian strategy, which proclaimed by the deed: We have no Roman capable of meeting you in open battle, even at great odds. Rome with many more soldiers,

and a better trained infantry, is humiliated by such a confession. She somehow does not bear Great Men, but submerges all strong individuality in her Association.

The first sumptuary law of Rome was passed this same year (215), possibly in consequence of the cramped finances after the defeat of Cannæ. It was directed against the extravagance of the Roman woman, who, according to Livy, was allowed only half an ounce of gold, was prohibitted from wearing a many-colored dress, and was not permitted to take a carriage ride in town. But twenty years later this law (*lex Oppia*) was repealed, the war being then over and Carthage taken.

Much agitation there must have been in Rome which could not help responding deeply to the terrible calamities of the struggle. The general result was to cement more closely the two Classes and to fix them in their principle of Association. The experience was a preparation for associating the civilized world outside of Italy.

B. *Outer Conflict.* This is what now absorbs all the energies of Rome, existence itself being at stake. The Hannibalic War goes back to Hamilcar Barcas, the father of Hannibal, who conceived the whole plan which the son carried out, and who also prepared the instrumentalities. He probably drew his first suggestion from the career of Rome, which had associated the Italic

peoples and thereby developed her greatness. Why cannot Carthage do with Spain what Rome has done with Italy? The truth is, however, that Carthage has not the Roman gift of Association, it subjects and enslaves peoples but does not associate them in a political union with itself. Hamilcar has, therefore, to slip away from his native city to Spain, and there do his work through himself, since he has the idea and not Carthage, the Roman idea we may call it, though he is practically the king and Rome does not tolerate kings. Hamilcar's association is personal, while Rome's is institutional and suppressive of the individual as leader or ruler. Still both seek to unite communities, tribes and peoples into a political order which will enable them to conquer the world. There is no doubt Hamilcar's organization, through his hatred of Rome, was primarily directed against Italy; he would have the third and last North-Mediterranean peninsula rule over the Second, and perchance control Europe's civilization. But he died ten years before the fulfillment of his plan, which fell to his son and the heir of his genius, Hannibal.

In the present case the transcendent father and more transcendent son recall Philip and Alexander. Philip, like Hamilcar, organized into an army backward tribes and peoples for the purpose of conquest, and Alexander, like Hannibal,

employed that army for the invasion of distant lands. But Philip and Alexander were of the same blood as the people whom they trained, while Hamilcar and Hannibal were foreigners to the Spanish, and not only of a different nation but of a different race, and employed them primarily as a means for wreaking a private and alien vengeance. It was the Oriental Semite making an onslaught against European civilization which had subordinated his mother-city and himself, to be sure in a remorseless way. Those Spanish peoples were doubtless Aryans mostly, yet they were dexterously turned against their own race by the wily Carthaginian.

Hannibal, when ready besieges and takes Saguntum, a city of Spain in alliance with Rome, passes the Alps and enters Italy in 218, where he wins a great battle on the Trebbia, a small stream flowing into the Po. Of course this victory confirms the tendency of the Celts in Northern Italy to revolt. He then moves forward into Central Italy, where he overwhelms the Roman consul at Lake Trasimene (217). The main object of this battle was to shake the allegiance of the Etruscans to Rome, but they remained firm. Hannibal passes by the Roman city and goes southward, where he annihilates a Roman army at Cannæ (216). Many of the South Italic peoples at once fall away from Rome. It is manifest that the plan of Hannibal

is first to cut all the threads by which Rome has associated these Italic peoples. Her slow work of centuries is to be undone. With the same design he descends into Campania and succeeds in getting Capua, the second city of Italy, not without the strong opposition of a Roman party. In fact he finds resistance everywhere from cities and towns whose walls he cannot take. So he begins to compel communities, and to punish those who will not revolt. He shows and has to show the Carthaginian autocrat, and the Italians query: Will Carthage be a better master than Rome? Then his chief auxiliaries are the Celtic barbarians, who have repeatedly devastated Italy. At any rate Hannibal does not bring autonomy in spite of his proclamations; he must organize these conquered and revolted peoples against Rome, and that means their subordination to his will. It is no wonder, then, that Hannibal's successful career begins to wane, for he has to reveal his real purpose. Still he stirs up Macedon against Rome, causes Syracuse and much of Sicily to revolt, and finally takes Tarentum (212) which carries with it a number of other Greek cities of Southern Italy.

On the whole, Hannibal has been successful from Trebbia to Tarentum (218–212). Seemingly he has snapped many of the main chords of Roman Association. But he has deeply contradicted himself to his revolted allies in his

promise of freedom. The jar begins to be strongly felt throughout Italy. He can win no more adherents from Rome who reached her lowest depth in 212, when Tarentum was lost in Italy, when Sicily was gone, and when the two Scipios had fallen in Spain. But during this same year Rome's fortune begins to turn. Marcellus takes Syracuse (212), Capua is re-conquered (211), Sicily is restored (210), and Tarentum is re-taken (209). Bitter is the struggle, but plainly Hannibal is losing. The peoples of Italy, having gotten their eyes open to the alternative, are refusing to accept the rule of the Carthaginian foreigner in place of the Roman native. Moreover Rome associates, even if imperfectly, while Carthage dominates and enslaves. Hence the fate of Hannibal hangs either from Carthage or Spain; he cannot bring the Italians to destroy Italy and her supremacy. His brother Hasdrubal is on the way from Spain with a large non-Italic force; that was his sole remaining hope, which was utterly crushed by the defeat and death of Hasdrubal, with the destruction of his army at the Metaurus (208). This ends entirely the offensive career of Hannibal. During five years (212–208) he has been waging a long war, seeking to undo Italy through Italians—which does not succeed. When his expectation of foreign help is blasted, he withdraws into the lowest part of Italy called Bruttium, into

the Italian boot, where he stands at bay for four years (207–203). Finally he is recalled to Carthage to meet Scipio, who defeats him at the battle Zama (202) and ends the war. Carthage remained independent, but was shorn of her naval power, compelled to pay a large indemnity, and forced to get the consent of Rome for carrying on any war.

Such was the rounding out of Hannibal's phenomenal military career, in which he had, as he states it, "for thirty-six years been fighting the battles of his country."

C. *Great Men.* Of course the supremely Great Man of the time was the Carthaginian, Hannibal. About his military and also political genius there can be no question. Still he did not mediate the World-Spirit with his nation, he did not bring Carthage into line with the movement of civilization; on the contrary he was negative to Europe's historic evolution, and sought to undo it, but really undid his own work, his city and himself. Rome was compelled by him to go ouside of Italy, and to associate all Mediterranean peoples.

Again we are struck by the fact that Rome produced no Great Man in her greatest crisis. But so much the greater and more heroic appears the Roman Commonwealth (S. P. Q. R.), which seemed to move and fight almost without leadership. Still it had to pay the penalty.

Rome in her hatred of one-man power, had quite eliminated the strong individual, the political conditions did not permit him to grow. Aristos and also Demos were wonderfully developed and associated, but the third principle, Monarchos, of the complete institutional process was almost smothered. We have to smile at the Roman glorification of Quintius Fabius Maximus, the antagonist of Hannibal, and cannot help regarding as a doubtful compliment the famous line of Virgil, who is said to have taken it fron Ennius: *Unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem.*

Finally Scipio arose, a much greater and more positive man than Fabius, who wished to stop him from going to Africa and there conquering a permanent peace at the gates of Carthage itself. This fact illustrates the difference between the parties now arising, the old and the new Roman—the one wishing to stay inside of Italy, the other seeing the necessity of going outside of it in order to preserve it. Scipio in carrying the war into Africa only repeated what Hannibal had done on a scale much larger and more difficult. Not original with Scipio is the plan; Agathocles and Regulus had executed it before him. Scipio finds that the Africans will do what Hannibal thought the Italians would do—fall away from ths central city. The fact points to the essential difference between Rome and Carthage: the

one can associate communities and peoples, the other cannot.

We are then to note that the Roman People as a whole was the bearer of the World-Spirit far more than any individual leader of it, who hardly ever rose above the common level of the total body of citizens. Indeed the conflict lay between the one superlative genius organizing and commanding his masses from the outside, and the one associated community organized and commanded from the inside by itself.

The chief doubt which hangs over Hannibal's generalship is his refusal to march against Rome after the battle of Lake Trasimene, and then after that of Cannæ. Even Roman schoolboys discussed the question as rhetorical exercise. But Hannibal avoided walled towns, he had perhaps no siege train, and he was best in the open field with his veterans and cavalry. Here lay his genius, and he knew it.

The character of Carthage has shown itself to be such that it cannot assimilate the two chief peoples of civilized Europe, the Hellenic and Roman, nor can it be assimilated by them in turn. The Greek tongue was forbidden at Carthage, so hostile was she to the culture of Hellas, and hence to Europe's civilization. The result was that Carthage eliminated herself from the movement of the World's History which was voiced in antiquity by Hellas. Rome also found

that she could not associate Carthage, and so destroyed it utterly, in order to get rid of its ever-threatening negative power, so mightily shown in Hannibal.

III.

Mediterranean Association.

The next associative field of Rome is that of the non-Italic peoples which lie outside of Italy, but surround the Mediterranean. As already seen, this great new step was forced upon the Romans by Hannibal, who sought to unite Greece as well as Spain, the Orient together with the Occident, against the associative City-State of Italy, which he easily saw, threatened them all. The greatest enemy of Rome thus becomes unconsciously the means of her greatest aggrandizement. He compels her to possess Spain, if she would prevent the danger ever impending over her from the third peninsula (Iberian), which danger has been brought vividly before her by the career of Hannibal. In like manner she must proceed eastward and associate the first peninsula (Hellenic), which also menaced her in the very pinch of her greatest disasters. If King Philip V. of Macedon had been a tithe of Hannibal or of his great Macedonian namesake —but what is the use of employing an *if* in the World's History? Pyrrhus also had given a lesson concerning the peril which lurked across

the Adriatic. Rome can never eat her bread in peace till she has mastered and associated those outlying peoples who hang over her borders like an ever-menacing Fate. Then Carthage still exists, internally independent, active, yea commercially prosperous even under her heavy Roman doom—and she may produce another Hannibal, the very thought of whom makes Rome shiver. To the West, East, South, Rome has been scourged into seeing her problem—that of universal Association, at least within the Mediterranean circle.

Here then we have a new epoch of Roman History, in which we behold Rome's World-Association becoming actual and a conscious purpose. To be sure there is hesitation, there is the old-Roman party which keeps pulling back, trying to stop the wheels of the World's History while they are whirling at full velocity. Fabius and Cato are of this character, acting at their best as steadiers of the madly-speeding State.

The epoch runs for about sixty-eight years, from the end of Hannibalic War to the destruction of Numantia, and to the starting-time of the Gracchi (201–133 B. C.). We see Rome return to her non-Italic Association of the first epoch, but with a far wider sweep and an enormously increased momentum, called forth by the desperate conflict with Hannibal. She now first

attains consciously her principle of World-Association as the fruit of her first early Self-Association.

The fact is noteworthy that she also gets an historian, who treats her as world-historical. He is, however, not a Roman, but a Greek, Polybius of Megalopolis. Rome, devoted to her great task of Will, has not the intellectual culture, and cannot produce the man of reflection capable of grasping and formulating what she has done. Greece, therefore, is the first to understand and then to transmit Rome. Indeed the later Roman historians are largely copyists and imitators of the Greeks, who have supremely the gift of expression. The History of Polybius has as its central theme the World-Association of Rome, which he holds, took place "in less than fifty-three years" (from the beginning of the Hannibalic War to the battle of Pydna). In this time Spain, Africa, and Macedon were reduced to the sway of Rome. Polybius was one of the thousand Achæans who were deported to Rome in 167 (see preceeding p. 378) and remained sixteen years. In that time he studied Rome and became convinced of her great historic destiny; then he sought to impress it upon his conceited countrymen by his History.

In this epoch Rome will have easy sailing in comparison with the preceding Hannibalic tempest; she will experience no capital assault upon

her associative principle at her very doors like that of Hannibal, or even like that of Pyrrhus. After her fight for life, she rebounds and sweeps forth to her Mediterranean world which to a large extent she now associates. Her germinal process in the present epoch may be conceived as follows:

A. *Inner Conflict.* In this epoch the social life of Rome undergoes a great change, and even Roman character passes into a new stage. The one Italian City-State, having become world-associating, has to expand and even to break through its previous institutional forms. The inner conflict rises between the old-Roman virtue and the new-Roman policy, between the old-Roman frugality and the new-Roman luxury. The wealth of the world, particularly of Asia, comes pouring into the once poor and austere community and transforms it socially. The two Classes are getting to be the rich and the poor; the Senate is largely made up of rich men and their supporters; the money of the world flows in a golden stream toward Rome, while the authority of the world flows outward to the Rim of civilization. Soon it came about that the money bought the authority; in fact the purpose of the former was the latter. Therewith Rome began to find her limit both within and without; her historic end, that of Association, which made

her great, is in the process of being supplanted by another.

With this social an intellectual change goes hand in hand. Greek culture is conquering Rome, while Roman will is subjecting Greece. Greek Plastic Art comes to Rome in enormous quantities from the capture of Syracuse and of Corinth. Greek epic poetry is transfused into Latin hexameters by Ennius, the friend of Scipio Africanus. The Attic drama is brought to Rome by Plautus and Terence. Especially Greek philosophy is elevating the best Roman minds to a world-view in correspondence with Rome's World-Association. Notable was the embassy of three philosophers in 155, who came from Athens to Rome on political business, but seized the opportunity, it seems, to propagate their favorite science, which had already divided Rome into two parties that have continued to exist — for and against philosophy. In 173 the sect of Epicurus had been driven from Rome by a decree of the Senate, which decree in 161 had been extended so as to include all philosophers and teachers of rhetoric. It is said that the foregoing embassy left a bad impression, chiefly on account of the two discourses of Carneades, one day for and the next day against justice. Old Cato the censor did not like that, and evidently the three Athenian Scholarchs had to

hurry back home after making a famous failure in the capital of the world.

Still Greek culture stayed in Rome, who really could not get along without it if she were to complete her work. Scipio, the greatest man of the age favored it, and was himself a Greek scholar. Cato, the hard-headed, sharp-tongued Sabine rustic, played the old-Roman, and was bitterly anti-Hellenic, though he seems to have relented in old age, and actually to have started to learn Greek. Thus Rome begins to be Hellenized along with the rest of the civilized world, which is now Hellenistic. Greece has her empire in and over the Roman intellect, which to the last shows itself unable to create its own self-expression. Latin literature can hardly be called original, being so completely molded by Greek forms. The universe of Thought and the universe of Action are divided between the Greeks and Romans, and the division takes in the present epoch, and remains through the rest of the Republic and through the whole Empire, which at last becomes politically Greek.

B. *Outer Conflict.* In the present epoch Rome, reaching out from her center, coils herself around the whole Mediterranean. She shows the external completeness of her World-Association. Europe, Asia and Africa, in so far as they lie on the great Inland Sea, are enveloped by Rome, who thus becomes tri-continental. To

be sure she does not yet fully organize and provincialize the vast territory, still her mighty hand is outstretched over the whole of it, and it will hereafter furnish the work which she now maps out. From her Italian center we see her drawing her Mediterranean circle, which in a general way will remain the periphery of her empire to the last. Her limits are substantially laid down now, though the Celtic peoples in Gaul and Britain are yet to be won, and portions of Asia are yet to be made provinces.

Rome's World-Association in its spatial delimitation is, accordingly, to be brought before us at present. In the West, South and East wars are taking place, often contemporaneously. The best way is to look at each separately through the entire epoch, and then put them together into a common historic process.

(1) Spain kept up the struggle with Rome almost continuously from the close of the Hannibalic war till the capture of Numantia (201–133). These old Spanish barbarians seem to have shown the same military characteristics as did the modern Spaniards in the wars with Napoleon. It was easy for a trained army to overrun their country, but after that the trouble began. The guerrilla warfare at once started, and would bubble up in rear and front and flank, always unexpectedly. Then the Spanish town when besieged has shown the most desper-

ate resistance in ancient and modern times. The peoples of Spain were much mixed from far back; there was a strong infusion of the Celtic, and seemingly of the earlier Pelasgic stocks. But there was also a remnant of an aboriginal, pre-Aryan race, which exists to-day in the Basques.

Still the third and most Western peninsula had to be Romanized, otherwise it might be the field for another Hannibal, who was possible only through Spain. Much petty but vexatious fighting there was, till the country was tranquilized by Cato (195). But this tranquility did not last long, for it had to be restored by Sempronius Gracchus twenty years later, especially through the subjection of the Celtiberians. Very soon afterwards we hear of war with the Lusitanians (Portugal), who repeatedly defeated Roman armies. A Roman prætor, Sulpicius Galba, under the pretext of making a treaty, perfidiously slaughters many of them (150). But the deed of blood calls up as avenger, the Lusitanian hero Viriathus, who after winning battles often from Roman generals was privately assassinated through the instigation of the consul Cæpio (148–142). But the grand final act of the Spanish conflict during this epoch was the siege of Numantia, lasting fifteen months and conducted by Scipio Aemilianus. It had been the center of war against Rome for twenty years,

according to Strabo, and made a most heroic defense. When the provisions had run out, and no relief came, the inhabitants set fire to their city and threw themselves into the flames (133). This ancient siege of Numantia, together with the modern one of Saragossa (see the striking account in Napier's *Peninsula War*) have given to the Spaniards the palm for standing sieges.

In the fate of Numantia the Iberian peninsula realized the power of Rome, and for a time was at peace, though restless. More than once will the Hannibalic idea rise up again in Spanish bounds, and give Rome a fit of terror; especially was this the case with Sertorius. Cæsar kept a sharp outlook on Spain and hastened to suppress the risings there.

Notable is the fact that the Roman consul D. Junius Brutus (about 138 B. C.) penetrated through Northern Portugal to the Atlantic Ocean, which a Roman army then saw for the first time, and which is to have a great destiny in the future. But many centuries are to pass before European civilization will leave the Mediterranean and become Oceanic.

(2) Carthage must be destroyed—*delenda est Carthago*—so Cato voiced the feeling of Rome toward her humiliated rival, who still lived and commercially flourished, though without army and navy. The ever-lowering danger of another Hannibal, which rode the Roman soul like a night-

mare, could not be banned as long as his native city existed. Cato was fourteen years old when Hannibal first appeared in Italy, he served under Fabius at the sieges of Capua and Tarentum, and then went as quæstor with Scipio to Africa, whom he accused of extravagance in the use of public money. Thus Cato as a young man was tossed through all the ups and downs of the Hannibalic War of seventeen years, and could not forget his experience. Going to Carthage again as a very old man, and seeing her vitality and thrift, he took an awful Hannibalic scare, which came back upon him after more than fifty years, and caused him to end every speech with the above-mentioned quotation. The result was that Rome caught from him a spell of her old Hannibalic terror, which was probably intensified by the bad news from the Spanish war then going on, and she decreed the utter deletion of Carthage, which took place through the army under Scipio Aemilianus (146). Oft repeated has been Scipio's prediction of the fall of Rome as he viewed the ruins of the destroyed city, quoting the lines of Homer, "The day shall come." One cannot help thinking that he was instigated to such a melancholy reflection by his friend, the Greek Historian Polybius, who had seen his own country fall under the dominion of Rome, whose turn will also come—and it did. Thus the negative might of the World-Spirit had

been already perceived in antiquity—witness the row of rising and falling nations, Persia, Greece, Macedon, Achæa—and next Rome.

(3) But the most important war of this epoch lay to the east of Italy, in Hellas and West Asia. The latter through Alexander and his successors had been Hellenized, so that Greek culture had spread far in the Orient, no one knows quite how far; it certainly reached India and probably touched China. The Roman world, however, was Mediterranean and never seriously crossed the Euphrates. To this limit Rome was the heir of Macedon, which was composed of two parts, an Hellenic and Hellenistic, or an European and an Asiatic constituent. To be sure Alexander's Empire split to pieces after his death and became the new Greek Polyarchy. When Rome begins to enter decisively the World's History in a process with Greece on Greek soil, the Macedonian realm lay chiefly in the Greek peninsula, and no longer controlled all of that.

Now the king of Macedon (Philip V) had entered into an alliance with Hannibal after the battle of Cannæ; the result was the first Macedonian War, which brought Rome into the Greek peninsula, though in a small defensive way, as she had her hands full in Italy. But when the Hannibalic War was concluded, Rome had not forgotten the danger on her Eastern flank—which

danger had likewise shown itself in the invasion of Pyrrhus. So she starts to associating Greece, association being also her task in Spain. But there is this enormous difference: Spain is barbarous, while Greece is civilized, and intellectually much stronger than Rome with all her will-power. The result is a curious double, interacting process: Greece Hellenizes Rome culturally, while Rome associates Greece politically. Each despises the other, because each has not the other's gift; still they have to form a partnership, in spite of themselves, obeying the mightier decree of the World-Spirit. This will give the later Greco-Roman world, different from earlier Greece as well as from earlier Rome.

Already we have given a short outline of the Roman interference in Hellas proper from the battle of Cynoscephalæ (197) till the destruction of Corinth (146) followed by the provincializing of the peninsula. Three political forms—the old City-State, the new Federal State, and the Macedonian Empire-State were struggling for mastery when Rome came upon the stage and swallowed them all (see the account of Macedonian Hellas subordinated by Rome on the preceding pp. 380–390).

The movement of Rome out of European Hellas into the Hellenistic Orient may next be glanced at. The Syrian Monarch Antiochus very

naturally sees danger in the Roman influence over Hellas, into which he crosses over from Asia Minor, with an army which is defeated at Thermopylæ (191). Antiochus hastened back to Asia Minor where the Romans under command of L. Scipio (brother of Africanus who was with him in command) fell in with the Syrian king and utterly defeated him at Magnesia (190). Asia Minor was taken from him, which afterwards showed the Greek tendency to split up into little States more or less under the authority of Rome, though it was not yet provincialized. From this time Roman influence dominated Syria, as well as Egypt, and the Mediterranean circle was practically complete.

C. *Great Men.* Ancient authors have noted the co-incidence that the three greatest men of the age died in the same year (183)—Hannibal the Carthaginian, Philopœmen the Greek, and Scipio Africanus the Roman. Hannibal, driven out by his own city, and hunted by Rome through Asia, at last perished by his own hand at the court of Prusias, King of Bithynia, when about to be delivered up to his enemies. Rome breathed easier when he was dead, but his ghost kept troubling her till her end. Hannibal represented all the elements hostile to Roman Association, and he also possessed the power of holding them together and organizing them into an army "which never mutinied against him nor

fell out among themselves, though composed of Africans, Spaniards, Celts, Italians, Greeks and Carthaginians" (Polybius). He was the all-concentrating and all-fusing Negative of Rome, truly her Devil, who could scare her worse, soldier that she was, than any other foe in her history.

If we have to place Hannibal in the rear of the World-Spirit, fighting for a transcended principle, we have to put Philopoemen, the hero of the Achaean League, in advance of his time, since he devoted his life to the principle of Federalism, which has been realized in the United States. The federation of the Achæan Cities was hostile to the Roman idea of association, and so they too had to be provincialized with the rest of Greece. But this was long afterwards, and Philopoemen died in the height of his own and his country's glory.

In Scipio Africanus the Roman City-State has produced a Great Man, almost in spite of itself, for, as already said, its spirit was to subordinate and suppress the strong individual. But the fateful emergency calls him forth, as the only adequate counterpart to the mighty one on the opposite side, Hannibal, over whom he wins the final decisive victory at Zama. He is, therefore, Rome's greatest man, yea, greater than Rome even, who had shown herself unable to put down her supreme foe. Thus the dualism be-

tween Rome and her own loftiest genius has appeared, and the two sides begin to grind together in the shrillest discord. A kind of Monarch has again risen; what shall be done with him? What is he to do with himself?

The career of Scipio at Rome is not a happy one. After the battle of Magnesia he was required to give an account to the Roman People of his transactions in Asia; in the presence of the Tribunes and the Assembly he tore up his papers, and asked the multitude to go with him to the capitol in order to give thanks to the Gods for his victory of Zama and his other services to his country. Too great to be accountable to the Roman State, he in conduct declares himself above S. P. Q. R. What will he do? Overthrow the constitution and make himself the irresponsible one-man power? No, he is still too much of a Roman for that step; yet he is too much of a Great Man to submit. He feels the rift between himself and the institutions of his country. Too true was the charge that he deemed his nod "equal to the decrees of the Senate and the command of the People."

Scipio withdrew from Rome to a little town of Campania, and never afterward visited the city. There he lived for some years, consuming his soul with the self-lacerating thoughts of the unappreciated genius of which we can hear an echo in that inscription on his tomb written by himself:

Ingrata Patria, ne ossa quidem mea habes. There is some doubt, however, about the actual burial-place of Scipio, but of that deep inner scission of his heart there can be no doubt. In him the lurking conflict of Rome has come to the surface and revealed itself in what may well be called the tragic fate of the Roman Great Man. Him the State suppresses, but cannot do without; his supremacy saves it, yet he is thereby undone. (See Livy's graphic narrative, XXXVIII, 50–55).

Nor should we leave unmentioned here Scipio's Roman antagonist and indeed antitype, the elder Cato, who was the real instigator of these attempts of the Tribunes to compel Scipio to accountability. Cato sought to go back to the old-Roman time, and to have the city keep within Italy. He was the Roman opponent of Rome's World-Association, even if he as soldier went to Spain and Greece. As Censor he showed his strong reaction against the new ideas infiltering through the foreign conquests, especially of Hellas. He is the one who really drives Scipio out of Rome, as the latter more than any other man of his time broke down the old Roman limits. But Cato too failed in the end, for the Spirit of the Age was against him.

But the day is coming, yea is just at hand, when the Great Man of Rome will not be snuffed out even by Rome, after having done her his

his highest service. He will not return and sulk, but will go forward and seize; he will assert his supremacy not merely outwardly against the foe, but inwardly against the city which will become his extinguisher through his very excellence. Scipio is prophetic of Marius, of Sulla, yea of Cæsar, mighty individuals of our next period who will neither withdraw nor let themselves be submerged.

Here we also see the grand limitation of the Roman Republic: it did not mediate adequately its Great Men, without whom it could not be great. That old republican Constitution sought to get rid of Monarchos, leaving Aristos and Demos to perform the whole process of State. The suppressed, yea wronged element, which had still to do its work in secret, so to speak, has broken out of its straitcoat and proclaimed itself; next it will move forward to the deed.

So this great middle period of Rome's History, the Roman association of the World, concludes, showing the mighty expansion of the associative City-State outwards to its limit or Rim, quite embracing all whom it is able to associate. The inward movement falls into the background, but will soon begin again with renewed energy. For this outward association of peoples is unequal, but their association must be equalized with Rome herself, or at least must start to moving that way. As Rome's evolution equalized her two

unequal Classes, so she must equalize her unequal Provinces, and thus make herself truly actual, existent in the world.

Rome, the one center, is first to impart its governing ability to other centers, more or less to other cities which become capitals. It has the tendency to make each man a Roman, civilize him, and finally citizenize him. But just that process is the undoing of republican Rome as a City-State, with its body of world-governing people, who must also be associated. The *populus* of Rome is what universalizes itself; out of it springs the Empire which makes all equal, at first, however, negatively, by subjecting all and especially the Roman People to one man, so that it has no longer controlling power.

So the whole Roman world is to be equalized positively, is to be granted certain rights under the Emperor. But this outcome is not yet here, though implicit and strongly fermenting. Rome has first to evolve her Great Man, and this is explicitly the next period.

Section Third.

The World Associates Rome.

The reader will note that the title of the present Section is given as the counterpart and completion of that of the previous Section. Then Rome associated the World, now the World associates Rome. Hitherto the association has been one-sided, accomplished by Rome through taking away the inter-communal principle, or the external side of autonomy, and forcing all communities and peoples to be associated through herself. The demand or movement now is not simply to restore the former inter-communal relations, that would be a fall back into the old separative atomic condition from which Rome has freed the World. All peoples and cities (of course with exceptions) which have passed through the Roman associative power, begin to show the desire to share in it. The aspiration has been born to participate in world-government and through it to attain self-government, which is thus no longer isolated but is mediated through the great totality of peoples joined with Rome.

Again the stress of Roman History returns to the inner conflict, as was the case largely in the first Period. The outer conflict or the external

association of outlying peoples by Rome still goes on; but this is hardly more than a repetition and extension of the task of the last period (the second).

The movement of Roman History accordingly, begins to wheel around and start back toward the center, toward Rome itself. This peculiar self-reversion of its historic sweep takes place through a new power which at present rises to supremacy, namely through the Great Individual whom Rome in this period produces in astounding fecundity. Hitherto the Roman hero has showed his excellence and won his name by subordinating himself to the one central City-State. But now we shall see him again and again subordinating it to his party and personal ends. The imperial Master has begun to appear distinctly in Marius, and the line never stops till it culminates in Cæsar.

The World having been substantially conquered by Rome, is next to share in its own conquest. The fruits of the great victory it is also to enjoy on its side, though they are not to be plucked at once, but are to be ripened with time. Or, to use that term which we have employed for expressing the deepest fact of the Roman historical movement, the World is now in its turn to associate Rome, quite as Rome has associated it in the preceding period. Not only the Italians but also the Provincials are to return to Rome the

center, from which they have been conquered and ruled, and are to conquer and rule her, at first externally indeed, but at last internally, participating in the associative power of Rome, which is her very essence, and therefore getting to be what Rome herself is. When Julius Cæsar increased the Roman Senate to 900 members from less than half the number, putting into that high position Gauls from the Provinces (some of whom could hardly talk Latin) and Freedmen who had been once captured in war, it is evident that the conquered have gotten possession of what conquered them, or the associated have become associating, and thus are themselves performing the work of Roman association, or at least sharing in it. The Senate, once the chief administrative body of the Roman Republic, which controlled the World, is now controlled by the World, especially if a majority of the Senate are Cæsarians. Truly the outside is becoming inside, and is itself ruling the outside which it once was.

This is a movement toward self-government, yea toward the World's self-government, which in its highest manifestation we have called the State universal. Still we are not to forget the limitation. The Provinces on the one side and Rome on the other are determined by the strong hand of the Great Individual, who brings the outsiders into the narrow, hide-bound Senate,

and transforms it by his fiat and keeps it transformed. The World associates Rome not through itself, not of its own inner energy, but by means of an external might which has to be continually exercised. The mediational power which unites the Rim and the Center, the Provinces and Rome, has still to be outside, to be a personal Will over both. What if that Will get awry, and cannot do its work of mediation? That is indeed the new Roman problem, the imperial one; really it is a European problem and under different forms still exists.

The outcome of the Roman Republic is the one-man power, the Monarch; such was also its beginning in the kings of Rome. Cæsar is a return to the starting-point, and he knows it; in a number of ways he expresses the fact and tries to make it a part of the new-born political consciousness of Rome. He set up his statue as the eighth after those of the seven early kings, and it is only too plain that he coveted the royal title as the true designation of his position in the State. But Rome hated the idea of kingship, yet it never did and never could get along without it in some shape. What else is the dictator, even the consul, and especially the pro-consular authority in the Provinces, really the imperial training-school? In fact it is not too much to say that the grand travail of the Roman Republic, especially of this last period of it, was to restore

the one-man power, the Monarchos, as an integral element of itself and indeed of every complete government. The three political constituents which make up the community—Demos, Aristos, and Monarchos—were present in the early History of Rome, but Monarchos had been driven out by the Republic, discredited in every way, and put under the ban of the law. Still in a disguised form he was always present, for he cannot be wholly dispensed with. But the time has come when he is going to return openly and hence illegally, when he will put down Demos and Aristos at Rome as they have put him down, rendering them subordinate to him, instead of an integral part of the governmental process with him.

If Romulus at the start of Rome made citizens out of his captives in war, and thus gave them a share in his new City-State, so also does Cæsar, who therein goes back and connects with Romulus. In the one case, however, it is only the little germ on the banks of the Tiber, in the other case it embraces quite the whole of the Mediterranean World. Very suggestive it is to see the two founders at the beginning and end of the Roman cycle interlinking in a common principle. Thus the History of Rome periodizes itself, and rounds out the Republic, with the transition into the Empire.

As already indicated, the present is the third

stage of the Republic, in which the World associates Rome through the Great Individual. It is worth while to note distinctly the three elements here involved: the World, Rome, and the Man, the latter now placing himself above both and mediating them in the new political process. The Roman City-State as a whole, as S. P. Q. R. has made itself the patrician to the World as plebs, and its old inner fight between the two Classes has become an outer struggle between the World (as Demos) and Rome (as Aristos). She harmonized her inner dualism between plebs and patrician, and then went forth to conquer the Mediterranean lands, wherein she externalized her twofold nature, which then became her great new problem, begetting even more intense conflicts than her former Classism. The result is, however, a new reconciliation of this last dualism of the Republic in which the plebs, now as Italians and Provincials, are taken up into patrician Rome, into the central governing machine S. P. Q. R., and are made to participate through it in the rule of the World.

It has been already observed that the Rim of conquered Peoples has been drawn around the Mediterranean by Rome, who has made herself the center. This Rim will be extended during the present period by fresh conquests, but it will suffer some desperate assaults from outlying nations. Two of these may be here mentioned.

On the North and North-West lie the Celts, who have already impinged upon Rome not a little. Their supreme effort to break through the Roman line will meet with a complete repulse at the hands of Marius. The Celtic race, having little civilization, can be Romanized both culturally and politically. The second grand assault upon the Roman line is made in the East by Greco-Oriental peoples, especially by Mithradates, king of Pontus. This part of the Orient had been already Hellenized by Alexander and his Successors. Politically it can and will be made Roman, but not culturally. Rome cannot assimilate Greece intellectually; in fact the mind of Greece is taking possession of Rome during this time. Thus a new cleavage between two conquering powers, Greece and Rome, that of the Intellect and that of the Will, begins to show itself in the same territory. Hereafter we shall see great historic results springing from this peculiar dualism.

The present third division of the History of the Republic starts with the first attempts of the Gracchi, and lasts to the completed result in the Empire, the whole continuing a hundred years and more (133–31 B. C.). We shall first see those nearest to Rome, the Italians, obtaining citizenship and participating in Rome's world-association; then come the Provinces, of course under the leadership of Roman Great

Men, who bring with them finally the World, or make a good start toward doing so.

On the whole during this entire Period it is the Great Man who centers attention upon himself. Through him the World extorts association from an unwilling Rome, really forcing her to begin to impart her principle to those whom she has associated. Compulsory is the act; as she has compelled them, so they now compel her to associate. The Great Man is at present the Rome-compeller; the person has to take hold of the impersonal State, and to make it not merely associative but personal in the Empire, through which Rome will voluntarily impart her boon to the World, namely that of association, in so far she has developed it.

I.

Italic Association.

Already we have witnessed Rome's association of Italy; now we are to see Italy's association of Rome, imperfect though this be in the final settlement of Sulla. Still the main current of the present Epoch (the first of our third Period) is that the Italic peoples get to share in Roman association of the World. These are also the consanguine peoples, which we have seen constituting Rome's earliest association, first in the

three small communities of her embryonic state, and then in the three large nations.

Great Men during this Epoch begin to assert themselves as the chief centers of power, even against their institution. They do not hesitate to employ a part or party against the whole State for the purpose of subordinating it or even undoing it, to their personal end. Yet this personal end consciously or unconsciously makes for the general end, which is that the Roman World must be brought into association with central Rome herself, the conquered outsiders must become the conquering insiders, sharing in what conquered them and making it their own. To be sure there is no such attainment in the first Epoch before us, but things are marching that way, which undoubtedly leads to Cæsar. The grand obstacle to this world-association is the Roman machine S. P. Q. R. with its enormous power, its buttressed privileges, and its domineering pride born of long and colossal success. Now it is this machine which must first be broken to pieces ere association be possible. Such is in general the function of the Great Man of Rome during the present Epoch. Dividing the whole into its parts, he will use one part (or party) against the other part, but really subordinating the whole to himself. Thus the autocrat, the imperator, the one man over the State appears. using it to his end, yet making his Will a part of

its process. Such we may deem in its historic evolution the first imperial act. Marius and Sulla as well as the Gracchi will all show in various ways this early imperialism, forerunner of the Cæsarian, in fact the germ out of which the latter develops with the hatching years.

We are now to witness the effect of Provincial government, which, given to the strong Roman character, made him tyrannical. He, being irresponsible except to the Senate, which was his own order and would commonly shield him, rapidly evolved the one-man power, which is now to return to Rome from the Provinces. The Senate itself became chiefly a body of satraps past, present, and future, to whom the world had become a kind of prey. The orations of Cicero against Verres are a monument of the abuses of this sort of government. One of the great acts of Cæsar was to put an end to this satrapal rule, and to place the Provincial Governors under law, with supreme control from the central head— which at least reduces the many tyrants to one.

The great fact of the preceding era of Rome was the unity and co-operation of the two supreme Classes, Senate and People. This had been brought about after long and intense conflicts between plebeian and patrician. But a new scission is entering and separating the two constituent Classes, the main issue being the question of association, with many collateral issues.

S. P. Q. R. now splits within itself into its two halves, which are repeatedly turned against each other by the Strong Man of the time, and are ground to pieces in continuous self-trituration. So it is known as the period of Civil War.

In this epoch we are again to see that process which we have so often found to be germinal in Roman History. Its three elements run on three lines synchronously with a continuous intertwining of events, which form the total Epoch. This lasts from the appearance of the first Gracchus (133) till the death of Sulla (78). Very full of complicated historic currents is this remarkable time, but we are at last to see its unity in the one great end already designated.

A. *Inner Conflict.* Rome begins to turn back upon herself from her outer struggles, which now become inner. There is a repetition of the old strife of the Classes, but its arena is not now the small City-State on the Tiber (as in the first Period) but all Italy, and then the World. Such is the new division and conflict of the Classes. Still the World's Association of Rome has to be fought through inside of Rome as well as outside. Such a movement is coupled with the name of Gracchus, and has made it world-historical.

The present process will show the undoing of S. P. Q. R. in both its elements, the Senate and

the People, which are hurled against each other in a mighty destructive wrath. We may say that the World-Spirit uses the great Roman as a party-man, driving him to destroy the other side which, however, will rise up and destroy its opponents in turn. Thus both sides or parties are undoing each other, and undo the State of which they are the constituents. The Gracchi leading the People are suppressed along with their party by their Senatorial antagonists, who are overcome in their turn by the Italians and Marius. But Sulla, returning from the East, puts down again the popular party in the name of the Senate. Really, however, he is dictator and dominates both sides. Thus the whole State has gotten its master, after each element had previously undone the other.

(1) Tiberius Gracchus, in a very modest and entirely legal manner starts the movement, having been elected Tribune of the People (133 B. C.). He proposes what is known in Roman History as an agrarian law, whose object is to distribute to needy citizens the Public Domain, or the lands held by the State through conquest and other causes. Now these public lands had been seized and kept by wealthy men largely of Senatorial connection, who claimed a title to them through long use and prescription. At this point, then, the People and Senate began to lock horns.

The measure of Gracchus was no innovation; it was simply the re-enactment of an old law known as the Licinian Rogation, which was adopted in 367 B. C., with two other laws even more drastic in favor of the People. These three Licinian laws were the chief measures in equalizing and uniting the old Classes, Plebeian and Patrician, based on the distinction of birth. But that which once had the power of unifying has become the means of separating the Classes after some 234 years of co-operation and victory, and just this success is the source of the trouble. The Senate as the directive agency of the government and administrator of its conquests, has become a body of the Lords of the World, which it exploits for its own advantage. Its members are both avaricious and prodigal, very much changed from the old Roman of the time of Licinius and Cincinnatus.

So the ancient conflict between Senate and People breaks out in a new form. The time approaches for the enactment of the law, when another Tribune, Octavius, stops the proceeding by his veto, being probably bribed by the opposite party to do so. Here comes the real test of the leadership of Tiberius Gracchus. He gets Octavius deposed from office— an illegal act. Undoubtedly Octavius had violated the original purpose of his office, still he had legally the right to use his veto; he em-

ployed his form of right to nullify the spirit of the law. On the other hand Gracchus illegally vindicated his law; the result was he gave his enemies a handle for destroying him; having invoked violence he perished by violence. It was another instance of that oft-recurring difficulty: the legal spirit with illegal form versus the illegal spirit with legal form. It will have to be confessed that Tiberius Gracchus showed his lack of supreme leadership by getting caught in such a dilemma. Still he started the great movement of the new Period. Nor must we forget here to mention that it lay in his scheme to give the Roman franchise to certain Latin and perchance other Italian allies.

Ten years after Tiberius Gracchus, his brother Caius Gracchus takes up the same cause, only with much greater demands. His first work was to punish his brother's murderers. The agrarian law of Tiberius he renews and extends. The distribution of grain by the State at a low price to the Roman citizenship (the *annona*) he enacts into a law. Not so much a measure of charity is it as a right now asserted: the world must feed its rulers at Rome. A system of colonization lay also in his scheme. Particularly did he seek to limit the power of the Senate, taking away from Senators their judicial function, their control over the Roads and Public Works, their assignment of Consuls to Provinces. Little

doubt exists that Caius Gracchus dealt the Senate a blow from which it never recovered. The dualism between it and the People he renewed and deepened to the bottom.

So far his career had been a complete success. He was the Great Man of Rome, the idol of the People, with the hostile Senate humbled, the hitherto dominant element of the State. But now he makes his pivotal mistake for the time. Being re-elected Tribune, he brings in a bill to confer the Roman franchise upon the Latin colonies, and even upon other Italian communities (though this last is somewhat doubtful). The Roman citizens did not wish to share their citizenship and power with the Latins, and still less with the other Italians. In this respect the People were as hide-bound as the Senate. Moreover, the revolt of the Latin colony Fregellæ, because it did not at once get the franchise, made the time especially inopportune for such a measure. The severe punishment inflicted by Opimius upon rebels so near in place and blood was sanctioned by both People and Senate.

This was the prelude to the violent death of Caius Gracchus himself, who was proclaimed to be the favorer and favorite of rebels to the Roman State. Both the brothers committed the same mistake: through their impetuosity they violated formal law in the interest of ideal right. But the far deeper fact of their careers was that

they tried to bring their native city into harmony with the age, by causing the same to give up its exclusiveness, and to impart its privileges to the Allies who had helped them win the world. Rome, both Senate and People, refused, seeking to keep for themselves their monopoly of association, and slew their benefactors, for which deed we shall soon see the penalty.

(2) The agitation for the Italian franchise was transmitted from Caius Gracchus, who was felt everywhere in Italy to be its martyr. So the chasm between the Romans and the Italians (including the Latins seemingly) continued to deepen and to widen. The emergencies of the outer wars, especially those with Jugurtha and the Cimbri, kept the agitation down for some years. It must be recollected that both Senate and People werehostile to the Italian franchise. But the Great Man of Rome, its supreme soldier, happened to be an Italian, not a Roman; Marius, the savior of Rome, was of Arpinum, which was originally a Volscian town, but had become a municipium, and was enrolled in a Roman tribe, the Cornelian. Thus he was legally a Roman, but his origin and honors would necessarily recall the services of the rightless Italian.

Finally the cause of the Italians was undertaken by the Tribune, M. Livius Drusus, who was largely a repetition of Caius Gracchus, and who soon met with the same fate. So far was

the hostility to the Italians carried that a Tribune, called Varius, a native Spaniard, put through a law that all who favored the Italian franchise were guilty of treason to Rome. By this law the prominent friends of the Italians were scattered—some were impeached, others fled into exile. S. P. Q. R. had shown its utter hostility to share its rights with those who had helped to win its Empire. Both elements, Senate and People, were equally exclusive, determined not to impart their privileges to their unprivileged Allies. Rome was again Patrician and Plebeian on a new and far larger scale.

The Italians were furious. At once there began to seethe around the periphery of the Roman City-State the three consanguine nations of ethnic Italy which Rome had associated with herself at the end of the first Period. Etruscan, Latin and Sabellian seemed to threaten Rome with a new secession which would throw her back to her original limits. But it was the Sabellian, particularly the Samnite, who began a War, urged on by ancient hate. The revolted peoples had Roman military discipline, for they claimed to have furnished two-thirds of the armies of Rome, with which she had conquered the World, yet "they were treated as aliens." It is not surprising to learn of their numerous victories.

This is known in Roman History as the Social War, or War of the Allies. Rome at first sought

to cherish the idea of association by the word *Allies* (*Socii*), meaning associates, not subjects. Yet Rome always claimed to be the associator, and to determine the rights of her Allies, who now have begun to clamor for and even to war for an equal right of association with Rome. These Allies were Rome's own kindred, her consanguine peoples. Gracchus, possibly having the instinct of this kinship, would have Rome give her franchise voluntarily to her own relatives; but no! it will have to be done by compulsion, by war, this being the way in which their association was first brought about by Rome.

So great was the danger that the haughty Senate began to think of conciliation and concession. A law (Lex Julia) was passed that those Italians who had taken no part in the war or had ceased to fight should have the Roman franchise. This was made to meet specially the case of the Etruscans in the North who had shown decided signs of unrest. The Latins also now received their long-coveted boon of Roman citizenship. But the Samnites resisted to the last, and had again to be apparently wiped out by Rome. It was in this war that Sulla first showed his great military capacity, outshining even Marius, who though in command also, did not do much. Really the Italian enemies of Rome were his friends, and many of them had been his soldiers.

A new law, supplementary to the Julian law,

was still more liberal. It gave the Roman franchise to the Italian allies, but also to certain Provincial allies domiciled in Italy. It is well to note the entering wedge of Provincial rights which will also have a great future. But now ethnic Italy, after centuries, takes her next great step in association with Rome, and is endowed with Roman citizenship. The Italians were enrolled in ten new tribes, by themselves, while the Romans kept their thirty-five tribes—a decided majority, as the voting was done by tribes. Even Transpadane Gallic communities obtained an advance to the Latin Right. The Sabellian revolt really enfranchised the Italians, for it was that with the possibility of another Pontius or Egnatius which scared Rome into her great concessions.

Unparalleled courage the Samnites again showed, but they had no power of associating the other Italic peoples with themselves, whose battle they had been fighting. But after all admiration for their bravery, we have to say that their cause was not only impossible but condemnable in the view of the World's History. The freedom which they battled for was completely dissociative, and would throw Italy back into its original atomic condition, wholly undoing the associative work of Rome.

The Sabellian war, while it brought new union to Italy, laid open to view the next great conflict

which associated Rome will have to meet; the Provincials also will be demanding the Roman franchise. Three layers of concentric peoples, Roman, Italic, Mediterranean, surround the City-State which is now to be associated by them all. Italy has associated Rome from without, by the Sabellian war (Social). Rome in her turn is defeated, is associated at first by violence, is really conquered in her associative power, which all the Allies desired.

(3) It has become plain through the Sabellian (Social) War that the World outside of Rome, the extra-Roman Peoples, can associate Rome by force alone, to which she will finally yield. This is indeed only giving back to her what she has done, for she has associated the World by force, and by force she must be associated. Gracchus, we now see, tried to avoid this time of violence by persuading Rome to grant its citizenship to its associated Italians (or Allies) through law. Drusus tried to bring about the same end. But they were both slain at Rome, and their fate indicates that a peaceful association of the World with Rome through Rome is not possible.

The great boon of participating in S. P. Q. R. must be extorted from its possessor by war. This is distinctly the process now going on in the Roman world. So far the Latins and Italians have been admitted to citizenship, and thus

to association on terms not yet equal but looking thitherward. But the conflict is by no means yet ended. Like the law for the equalization of the Classes, this present law for the equalization of the Allies, will have to undergo repeated backsets, in fact actual annulment. Still it will be restored and with it will come its companion, the franchise for the Provincial.

The demands upon Rome are indeed many and great. The City-State in its conquest or association of the World from the one center, has called up many grades or classes of people who are on some side deficient in complete association. They are on the way to the top of the mountain, forming circles about it and striving upward toward Rome. We may liken the situation to the rings of Dante's Purgatorial Mount. And the Roman discipline of the nations is a purgatorial one. An inventory of these defectives may be taken as follows: breadless, landless, rightless, freedomless. They are the grand army of the *withouts*, that is, they are without that which Rome herself has and can impart. All will be wrenched from her chiefly by force, for her spirit is that of a monopolist of association.

Rome has become an exclusive oligarchy in character. It was not always so. It was not so at the start, and Romulus, as Tacitus declares, made citizens of his captives in war. Rome was at first fair toward the Italians, when she first

associated ethnic Italy, before the provincializing of Sicily, which introduced the autocratic policy and disposition. Even in the Hannibalic War, her Italian Allies on the whole clung to her. But after the submission of Carthage, the spirit of domination rose with the consciousness of being the first power in the world. Old Cato felt the danger when he asked: What will become of Rome when she has no nation to fear? Still it was Cato who reiterated *Delenda est Carthago*, because of Rome's fear of her rival.

Gradually she began to look upon the Italians who had helped her conquer the world not as Allies (Socii), but as subjects (Dediticii). Her tendency was to provincialize Italy, applying her non-Italian government to Italy. Here started the breach which ended in the Social (Sabellian) War already narrated. Her nearest neighbors and kinsmen, the Latins were treated insultingly, 20,000 being expelled from Rome in 187 B. C., not long after the Hannibalic War, in which the Latins had helped her bear the enormous burdens of the conflict. It was the merit of the Gracchi that they tried to stem, if not to transform this new character of Rome, but they therein made themselves tragic, the city destroying its own salvation. They would have Rome impart her association voluntarily to her Allies, but such a sudden whirl to an opposite policy and character she could not make.

Really the Italians and the Provincials have become the upholders and representatives of the principle of Rome herself, of universal Rome. If she is truly to Romanize the World, she must impart what is highest in herself, namely her power of association. Each city, each community is to share in this Roman boon, participating ultimately in the associated whole of the Roman world. Thus each is to be what Rome is in essence. And men are to become Roman citizens, having their part in the government of the totality, which also governs them. Such is the picture, verily only the dream of Rome as universal; or we may call it Rome in the vision of the World-Spirit. Which one of her Great Men sees her with that vision? None as yet, but he is coming.

But what is the actual situation, in contrast to this ideal one? S. P. Q. R. will seek to keep the machine, and control it in the selfish interest of a narrow City-State, or a narrower Senatorial Oligarchy. Violently she is to be subjected to her own process of association as she has subjected other peoples, indeed the Mediterranean World. Her own deed is to be applied to her terribly by those to whom she has done it. That is her stern discipline toward universality; it is the World-Spirit applying Roman discipline to Rome and training her toward the State universal.

B. *Outer Conflict.* It may be said that Marius and Sulla were products of the external wars of Rome, which thus are showing new results. These wars have become the training-school of the great military individuals who no longer subordinate themselves to S. P. Q. R., but are decidedly inclined to subordinate it to themselves Hitherto we have seen that Rome was able to absorb her Great Men into herself, but now the reverse movement has started. We have already seen the mighty Scipio torn asunder by the two conflicting sides in the previous epoch. The successful general, who has won in the outer conflict, turns inward and settles, for a time at least, the inner conflict of Rome.

We have seen in the antecedent Period (second) that Rome was chiefly occupied with external wars, which still continue through the present Period. Tri-continental had Rome become in territorial expansion; new peoples around the Rim were subjugated in every direction—South, North, East. Armies had to be maintained at a great distance from Rome, and to be kept in service. Thus the Roman army takes a new character, soldiering becomes a profession, and the men are separated from the civil institutions of their city and no longer perform civil functions. Marius reorganizes the army, which becomes a standing one and is devoted to its leader, who can wield the men as his instrument.

The personal relation of the soldier to his chieftain begins to outweigh his relation to his impersonal State. Thus in the Provinces and on the Rim the one-man power grew up by necessity, and commenced to go back to the center, Rome. The successful general belonged to a party, was a partisan, and like the soldier generally proposed to seize his foes by violence. Nay, he will through his army's personal allegiance seize the governmental machine S. P. Q. R., subjecting it to his will.

During this period the external wars of Rome change the citizen soldier who returns to his farm or calling and thence derives his economic independence, into the professional soldier who draws his pay. Large numbers of the poorer class, unprovided at home, become regulars in the military service.

(1) On the South the Jugurthine war in Africa developed a number of striking phenomena. It brought to light the corruption of the Senate as chief administrator of the Provinces, whereby this gave to itself a stunning blow. The present war was the one which unfolded the talents of Marius, the mere soldier who has also to play the part of a statesman. Sulla likewise distinguished himself in this war. Thus the two great rivals appear on the same stage, and in harmony at present. We behold the unity which is to separate into two mighty

individuals warring with each other, and dragging their country into their fierce collision. (The Jurgurthine monograph of Sallust has made the present crisis familiar to the classical student).

(2) In the North is the desperate struggle with the Celts, culminating in the invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones, and their utter defeat by Marius. It was a repetition of those descents upon Italy by Northern peoples, which run through History ancient and modern. The Gallic invasion of Italy and capture of the city nearly 300 years before, was present to every Roman soldier probably. And the Celts felt that they must make a desperate attempt against that people which had subdued them in the Po Valley, and was penetrating to their own homes in Farther Gaul. These Teutones were probably Celtic, or mixed. If they were Germans, the latter now first enter History (105–4).

(3) In the East the conflict of Rome with the Greco-Oriental world, found its culmination in the war with Mithradates, king of Pontus. The Roman Rim was established in West-Asia with a line extending from Europe to Africa. Thus the tri-continental empire of Rome, already born in the previous period, was confirmed and extended. Quite as important is the fact that this war furnished to Sulla the opportunity for training his soldiers to personal service and

loyalty in the Orient where autocracy is at home.

The two great historic counter-currents of the age thus are seen to co-exist, uamely, Rome's association of the world and the world's association of Rome. Indeed they are parts of the same process and work together for the same supreme end through the one will, the Great Man, whom we must next consider.

C. Great Men. At least three if not four men during this epoch get hold of the Roman machine (S. P. Q. R.) which is now world-governing, and use it at will. The Gracchi indeed perished in the act of winning control; but those after them will be more successful. It is evident that a new sort of ruler has arisen and is marching toward supremacy, that Rome has generated a personal power over its hitherto quite impersonal (Senatorial and Republican) authority. We have already seen this new autocratic power unfolding out the provincial form of government.

The tri-continental wars of this time have developed the new kind of Great Men, who as partisans will through their army subordinate the total government to a part or element. Their autocratic will becomes the fundamental power, the soldiery is their implement, the triumph of their party is their pretext or opportunity. But the real result is the subjection of S. P. Q. R. to the one man. Such is the outcome of the present

epoch of Roman History; the dictatorship of Sulla is not so much the victory of the Senate or of the Aristocracy as of the one absolute ruler.

The bitter conflict of the time evolved two men who were its true expression and its leaders. Marius and Sulla were developed together on the Rim first in the African and then in the Celtic wars. They co-operated to the one end, Roman domination, and kept themselves subordinate to the central authority. But with the Sabellian (Social) War a change came, they began to separate into two hostile partisans, growing less and less obedient to the State. Marius lost prestige in the war with the Italians who were his friends; Sulla gained what Marius lost, and was chosen consul. With this office went his appointment to command in the East against Mithradates.

This appointment of Sulla, evidently fair and legal, Marius was determined to thwart. He deemed himself the commander on the Rim; twice, in Africa and against the Celts, he had fought and won. Now he was to be set aside in the Orient where lay the chief booty and honor. He felt the sting, and started secretly to undo the act of S. P. Q. R. He wins a Tribune of the People, P. Sulpicius, to his purpose. The way was to distribute the enfranchised Italians equally with old citizens among the Tribes, and to grant citizenship to Freedmen who had served in the Italian Wars. In this way the new Citizens

would have a majority, would rule Rome, and choose Marius for the East.

Thus the cleavage between Italian and Roman, the new and old old citizenship has gotten into Rome itself, and the result is a bloody fight in which the new citizens, under the lead of Sulpicius directed by Marius, triumph. Sulla, who was present in Rome at the time, has to flee to his camp at Nola; his Eastern command is given to Marius who has now seemingly attained his purpose. But the Italians have taken Rome for the time; S. P. Q. R. has to yield to them and their leader Marius. Still no army had entered the City, the affair was a civil brawl, the like of which had often occurred before. But now the new thing appears, the real outcome of the time.

(1) The first Roman army under a Roman leader marches to Rome and takes it, subordinating S. P. Q. R. to his will backed by his soldiery. This was the act of Sulla, consul elect indeed, but exceeding all consular or constitutional authority. It was the birth of an epoch, of the new Great Man doing the new deed, even if revolutionary.

The Sabellian war was still going on, the Samnites at Nola were besieged by the Roman army under Sulla, who transfers it, or a large part of it, to the siege of Rome, and the so-called Social War passes at once into a Civil War, being internalized from Italian to Roman political par-

ties. So there are really two civil wars in Italy at the same time.

Sulla straightened out affairs at Rome in his own interest and Marius fled. Sulla claimed to support old Rome against the new citizenship, but old Rome did not like him, since he subjected it to his own Will, as did also the party of Marius. The political means were not now institutional forms, but the direct might of the soldier. To be sure Sulla had still the semblance of authority in being consul; also the other consul, Pompeius Rufus, joined his army when it entered Rome.

Three parties appeared in the field. The first was the Marian, supported chiefly by the new citizenship, Italians; the second was the Roman proper, S. P. Q. R. which still had its senatorial and popular parts. Sulla had put down both these parts. He had commanded the S. P. Q. R. to do his will; then to the Italian party as the Marian he was especially hostile.

He shows his political skill in slipping away from both enemies, leaving them to undo one another when he was absent. He hurries off to Asia with his army. Thus he is out of range of the inner eruption at Rome, and at the same he is training his soldiery on the Rim for a decisive return to the central City, which becomes at once volcanic.

(2) Cinna, one of the consuls and head of

the Italian party, again introduced the bill for the equalization of the New Citizens among all the Tribes, a scheme which would give them the majority. This was once more opposed by the Old Citizens and Senate; Cinna was driven from Rome and deprived of his consulship. He proceeded to the camp at Nola, to the soldiers whom Sulla had left behind, and who were discontented at not going along. He even invited the besieged Samnites to join with him, as well as various towns engaged in the Sabellian War. He seeks to unite the discontented Sabellians in an attack upon Rome, now consisting of the Senate and Old Citizens.

Thus the Sabellian War again becomes an Italian one, and the Sabellians seem to be uniting with the New Citizens who had accepted the Lex Julia—Latins and Etruscans. The original rift between Roman and Italian, which originated the conflict with the allies, cracks open afresh.

The next step in the movement is the appearance of Marius, full of revenge for being outlawed by S. P. Q. R. under the dictation of Sulla. Sertorius advises Cinna to keep aloof from the old man's vengeance, but the latter does not take the advice. Rome prepares an army in its turn, but the Italians enter and sack the city. Marius with his long hair had become an avenging Nemesis. The Italians, Freedmen, Slaves, Debtors, the grand army of the deprived,

now had by the throat S. P. Q. R. which had deprived them. The two Consuls perished; L. Julius Cæsar, the author of the Julian Law giving the partial franchise, fell a victim; so did Lutatius Catulus, winner of the Cimbric triumph. But the man most wanted, Sulla, was out of reach. Marius obtained his seventh consulship but soon died (86 B. C).

Such was the Italian retribution inflicted upon Rome, almost wiping out S. P. Q. R. Why? It has refused to associate them fully, and so is in turn undone by them almost. For that equal citizenship is what the time commands and Rome refuses.

Cinna was now dictator in the city, really self-appointed. But Sulla was out his power, and was also dictator in his domain. Cinna was slain (84) in a brawl; Carbo succeeds him, and gives the franchise to liberated slaves. Of course this alienates both Senate and People, so that all parties begin to hope for the return of Sulla from Asia, who is indeed on his way.

(3) The legions of Sulla with their chieftain land at Brundisium and march for Rome in 82 B. C. Young Pompey joins him, so does young Crassus, each of them destined to a famous career in the future. These two officers succeed in dividing the Sabellians, and in bringing the Northern portion of this Italic stock into the camp of Sulla, while the Southern portion, embracing

chiefly the Samnites, remain hostile to Sulla and indeed to any Roman connection. Their old enmity to Rome's association had never died, and now they might well think that the day of their vengeance had come. They looked down from their mountains and saw Rome rending herself to pieces. Two if not three parties, each seeking to destroy the others, were in contention.

Rome was indeed on the verge of ruin. It looked as if she was about to be dissolved back into her original ethnic elements—Latin, Sabellian, and Etruscan—all of whom seemed now to be moving toward dissociation. Every great leader had quit Rome for a stronghold in one of these nations. Carbo had gone to the hill of Clusium as his fortress, which recalled Lars Porsena, the great Etruscan enemy of Rome. Young Marius had occupied rock-built Prænestę, Rome's persistent Latin hater. The Samnites, thinking it time to interfere with effect, descend from their hills, though Sulla had seized their leading passes, appear at Rome and at first defeat Sulla under its very walls. A second Pontius, the Samnite leader, boasted with the rising sun that that this was Rome's last day, that the Roman wolf which had so long troubled Italy, was to be slain in its lair. This expression shows the deep-seated malignity of Samnium and of many Sabellians toward Rome for hundreds of years. Still Italy and the World and the World's

History are not yet done with Roman association. Without going into details, let the final word be said: Sulla is triumphant, is named dictator, and is really the first Emperor of the Mediterranean World.

There is no doubt that Sulla's victory prevented the reversion of Italy to its old condition, to its primitive ethnic and communal character. In fact without him Rome's World-Association would have been completely undone. The question came up to the conqueror pressingly: What shall I do to prevent a recurrence of this trouble? His method was mainly negative, destructive; there was little of the conciliatory in it. His first act of pacification was to butcher at Rome 6,000 Samnite prisoners in cold blood. Then Samnium itself was raided, the object being to exterminate literally this Italic people who had cherished such long irreconcilable hatred to Roman association. The party of Marius, which in its outcome had revealed itself as capable of dissociating Italy, must also be destroyed totally as a party. Moreover those ethnic communities—Latin, Sabellian, and Etruscan—which had shown themselves ready to undo Roman Association, must be hamstrung and dispossessed not only of their rights, but of their land. Hence sprang the reprobated Sullan proscription, by which large portions of Italy were assigned to Sulla's veterans, 150,000 of them it is said, grouped so

as to hold in check the old ethnic spirit and any form of discontent. It should be added that these old soldiers, used to plunder and violence, were dissipators of wealth; not only did they not cultivate their own soil, but drove away the peaceful tiller, and then sold out to great landlords who employed slaves. So the large estates (*latifundia*) which, says Pliny emphatically, ruined Italy, increased prodigiously through the Sullan proscription, which also had the effect of turning loose upon society great numbers of desperate men, veterans who had squandered their portion, and who were ready for any anarchic leader like Catiline. This Sullan soldiery had learned as their common speech a kind of Latin, which in this way began to be scattered throughout rural Italy.

By such violent and deeply negative means Sulla restored Roman association to Italy and to the Mediterranean peoples, wherein we see that he performed a world-historical function. But how can Rome be brought to keep what she has thus won back? This is the work of the new Constitution which Sulla proceeds to inaugurate, through his own will of course. He dictates to the Senate to make him Dictator (an office which had been suspended 150 years) seemingly for life; he enacts laws, administers the State, judges the Roman world; in fine he is S. P. Q. R. all to himself. Thus Monarchos has appeared

with a vengeance, though he uses all the old forms as the most convenient, and in fact ready-made channels of his will.

In his new Constitution Sulla gave to the Senate the central authority. He took away the Tribunician veto and only Senators could be chosen Tribunes, who had merely the power of personal protection. Sulla alone was to have the veto.

The Centuriate Assembly was restored as the law-making power, instead of that of the Tribes. Every law must be sanctioned by the Senate. It is plain that Sulla in these arrangements is seeking to go back to the old Senatorial or Patrician government of Rome, quite undoing the equalization of the Classes and the internal association of Rome which made her the conqueror of the world. The very instrument of her victorious career in the second Period is broken to pieces, as if that had been all wrong. But we must see the deeper reason. Such a ruin the great Roman machine of association must undergo before it can be built up again on the new incoming principle. Rome's association of the World is passing through its negative dissolving process, ere it can be re-constituted as the World's association of Rome, of which Sulla is an unconscious instrument. The judicial power is restored to the Sullan Senate, itself restored; thus a chief result of the Gracchan reform is undone in the interest of the new

Patriciate. In fact the whole popular movement of Roman History Sulla tries to stop and turn back quite to the starting-point of the Republic, which is thus to begin over again, having gotten all awry in the course of the ages. And yet the deep contradiction ironically leers out of all these proceedings of Sulla: he in this very act is the tyranical Monarchos,whom the Republic hated and put down, and thereby came into its first existence. Really the king is restoring with all his might what once suppressed the king and will again, as we soon shall see.

There is, however, one important gain which Sulla did not undo: Italic association. He declared at the outset that the Italians should keep their franchise if they had not been Marians—which very many of them had. Undoubtedly he sought to limit and to degrade this franchise. He freed 10,000 slaves of the proscribed, and at a stroke made them citizens of Rome, being called after him the Cornelii, and employed as voters for his measures. And nearly all the power of the People he took away and restored it to the Senate. But the future is not yet dead, though Sulla tries to kill it.

When he had satiated himself with making such changes, he laid down his dictatorship (in 80 B. C.), and retired to Puteoli, giving himself up wholly to pleasure. Rome, Italy and the World were at least tranquilized by him for a

time. He put the Senate again into the saddle and bade it ride. Can it? He died in 78, and with his death concludes an epoch. Italic association is preserved even if in maimed condition. But the coming Provincial association—Sulla never tackled that problem and with good reason.

Sulla is the Roman Mephistopheles at work in the State. He is the Spirit that denies, and so ends by denying himself. He seeks to undo quite all that Rome has evolved up to his time, and hence cannot well leave out himself in the last act. Negative we have to call him, negative to the movement of the age and of Rome herself, trying to reverse the wheels of Time and to make it go back to its Roman start literally. Still an ideal he seems to have had, that of the old Patrician Republic 400 years before his day, which he will somehow bring back by his arbitrary fiat. So much of the positive element we have to grant him.

Mephistopheles Sulla shows a deep, unconscious strand of diabolic humor in his last work. Will he put himself, the one-man power, as the latest development of the Roman State, into his new Constitution? Not a bit of it; that is just what he seeks to eliminate. Denying all evolution of Rome, he will deny himself as evolved by Rome, and wind up by a kind of political suicide. He tries to render such an appearance as himself impossible ever afterwards. His last

act of consistency seems to say: I ought never to have been, and I shall try to cause myself never to be again. When he is tired of his plaything, the World, he tosses it aside; then Mephistopheles gives himself up to unmeasured indulgence of the senses, through which he begets in his body hellish tortures (so some pious ancients report) whereby he dies the death of the damned.

However this may be, one thing is certain: Sulla did not eliminate the Great Man from Roman History, or put him under his former extinguisher, the Senate. For behold, here he comes, rising directly out of Sulla's own camp, shortly after the latter's decease.

II.

Provincial Association of Rome.

From the death of Sulla till the battle of Pharsalia and death of Pompey (78–48) the deepest current of Roman History runs toward bringing the Provinces to a participation in the Roman State. They are to have a share in governing the world; they are no longer satisfied with mere self-government. Such indeed has been the Roman training, which has imparted to them the aspiration for world-government; hence the Provinces now start for Rome in order to become an integral part of S. P. Q. R. whose deepest

trait has unfolded as world-governing. This trait is to be ultimately taken up by each nation, city, community, all of which are thus truly Romanized, and the individual is to become a Roman citizen.

This vast transformation does not take place at once; it is a growth and a long growth. But it very distinctly comes to the front in the present epoch, and constitutes the deepest principle of the same. Therein we see the contrast with the last epoch, which dealt especially with Italic Association of Rome. The positive task of Sulla was to make the Italians a part of the Roman people, which task he performed in his way. But Sulla did not deal with the problem of the Provincials, which was the next in order. As Rome took the Provinces and associated them with herself through the one-man power, so the Provinces are now going to take Rome and associate her with themselves through the one-man power. Such is indeed her own lesson and really her greatest gift to her associated peoples.

Accordingly the present epoch must evolve the Great Man capable of doing its work. Through his own descent he will be autocratic, since he is derived from the pro-consular *imperium* exercised in the Provinces. We have already noted that this entire Third Period of Rome was her time of Great Men; but the present Epoch is prolific of the most and greatest in her history. It was

indeed an age peculiarly productive of imperial characters (all seem to have been imperious); even the negative men of the epoch (Sertorius, Spartacus, Catiline) were Titanic in their attempts to annihilate Rome. The call was not merely for the Strong Individual to lead his Provincials against Rome and take it and perchance destroy it, but rather to reform and renew it, so that it can be associated and thus impart its boon to those who have it not. This was the grand positive trait of Julius Cæsar, the supreme personage of this epoch and indeed of Roman History.

Sulla had tried to bind down the Strong Man by law, and in that condition hand him over to the Senate. Yet who was Sulla? One of those imperial characters who had subjected the Senate and seized the governmental machine (S. P. Q. R.). In this way he sought to render himself impossible for the future. No second Sulla was to lead his army to the Capital and make himself dictator. Yet just that was what lay in the time and in Rome. Soon the Spanish war and Spartacus call forth two victorious generals who begin to break down the Sullan restraints. Pompey and Crassus were both Sullans, and so get ready to do what Sulla did, by first setting aside the latter's constitution. They would not be true followers of Sulla unless they did his pivotal act. Pompey restores the Tribunate and the legal competency of the assembly of the Tribes

to their pristine vigor (70 B. C,) both of which Sulla had suppressed. Thus Rome is again herself (S. P. Q. R.). But there is one great addition which comes from Sulla: the Italians remain and are associated in the new order. Through this new Roman People Pompey is given supreme authority against the pirates (Gabinian Law) and the next year (66 B. C.) is made commander-in-chief against Mithradates, king of Pontus (Manilian Law). This last act had two famous supporters in Cicero and Cæsar, though many of the Optimates opposed.

Through the accession of the new element, the Italians, there is a change in the character of the Roman People as a constituent of S. P. Q. R. The exclusiveness which even the Plebs once showed is breaking down. Also the prejudice against the Great Man is giving away. Still for a long time both Italians and Romans will show prejudice and discrimination against the Provincials—a fact which will be reflected in taxation, in office-holding, and in the laws. The equalization of the three concentric layers of the Mediterranean circle of peoples—Roman, Italic, and Provincial—will be peculiarly the work of the Empire. The Republic we have seen equalizing itself in its two Classes, and then partially taking up some of the Italians into equality with itself.

But we are to consider the process of that Epoch in which the Provinces are observed mov-

ing toward Rome in order to associate it with themselves.

A. *Inner Conflict.* Many of the old troubles between the Senate and the People were renewed, but these we shall not enter into. The striking fact of Rome's inner history during the present Epoch is the number of strong characters trying to seize the government directly by violence. It shows the consciousness of the time that S. P. Q. R. could be plucked like a ripe fruit by the mightiest man. Several thought themselves to be just this man. It is very significant of the prevalent spirit that Lepidus, a foolish fellow who had been elected consul, deemed himself the coming hero and made a start the very year of Sulla's death (78) He claimed to be the reviver of the Marian or Italian party. But he was soon suppressed, though some of his troops were kept together by L. Junius Brutus (father of Cæsar's assassin) whom Pompey afterwards slew in Gaul.

But the inner struggle of Rome showed itself on far deeper lines, and in the souls of far greater men than Lepidus. Three of these put the government under the severest strain in suppressing their destructive movements. It has become evident that the Roman Great Man, unless he can get control of S. P. Q. R. legally, will clutch it in defiance of law. He has broken loose from what has hitherto held him under, and he lays about himself in the most violent manner

during the present crisis, often with a hate of Rome which shows the nemesis of her conduct. Three such negative Great Men arise at this time and cause much trouble and inner conflict, each of them representing a phase of negative Rome herself.

(1) Sertorius was a Marian who fled to Spain after the triumph of Sulla, and started there in the third peninsula a counter revolution, which was meant to reach back to Italy. There is no doubt that Sertorius intended to repeat Hannibal, whose example still stirred the Spaniards to found a Spanish Empire in place of the Roman. He defeated all the armies sent against him, and came near ending the career of young Pompey. But he was at last poisoned by Peperna (72), a Roman follower of Lepidus who had fled to Spain. At his death Rome felt an enormous relief from the danger of another Hannibal. Sertorius proposed to bring his Provincials to Rome, probably not intending to destroy her (which was Hannibal's plan) but to associate her with his Spaniards. Thus he foreshadows largely what Cæsar really did.

(2) Spartacus, the gladiator of Capua, was a Thracian by birth, and represented a deeply negative condition in the Roman world. His field was Italy, though he was not directly supporting the cause of the Italians as such, nor even of the Provincials. As far as can now be seen, he

was the supreme Anarch of the age, the embodiment of Rome's destroyer. Escaping with his seventy gladiators, whose lot was to be "butchered to make a Roman Holiday," he was joined by slaves, outlaws, desperadoes of all sorts, many of whom had been old soldiers. More than 100,000 men are said to have flocked to his standard, whom he organized with Roman discipline, so that he beat in succession the armies sent against him, and threatened Rome. But his discipline finally went to pieces with such an unruly chaos of men; his destruction logically destroyed itself internally, when he was externally smitten by Crassus and perished (71), Pompey also slaying a detatchment on his return from Spain. Spartacus brings to light the deep-seated cancer of Roman society with its slavery. Already there had been slave wars in Sicily. We see an unassociated element rise against Rome who has produced it and refuses to it the right of association. Herein she denies her own principle in its universality. We must recollect that these slaves were of the same race, often highly cultivated; many of them were originally captives in war. Spartacus was Rome's self-negation incarnated and endowed with genius and energy; really she produced him, having created in him her own demonic destroyer. Still she succeeded for the present in slaying this monstrous birth of hers, but he will re-appear, and with victory.

(3) Catiline came somewhat later, being slain eight and nine years after Spartacus and Sertorius. Still he belongs to same group of destructive Great Men, who reveal the negative element of Rome. He was the born Roman noble becoming anarchic, and his followers were Romans. Very different were Spartacus and his band, chiefly slaves and gladiators, having no share in S. P. Q. R., but cast out, trampled upon, denied all association. Catiline's conspiracy, therefore, shows the negative element in the heart of Rome; the core of the State was in part rotten, and threatened to destroy the other part. Still this sound part succeeded in eliminating what was diseased, at least for a time. Catiline's plot was discovered and he with many of his followers perished, whose story is known to the tyro in Latin through Sallust and Cicero.

So we may put together the three leaders—provincial, servile, and noble—of this epoch of inner conflict, which shook Rome to the foundation. We can see in these struggles a certain order as they move from the rim of the Roman world to the central city itself. They are directed against the Republic, and are under the guidance of a one-man power which seeks to take possession of it, and govern it. In this sense they are all prognostications of what is coming, though by a different road. The Republic cannot be taken in that way, which is the negative

way. Through all these occurrences the man is present and active and very watchful, who is to possess republican Rome in a positive way, preserving it while transforming it. This is Julius Cæsar, not yet the soldier but the Roman politician, who is certainly getting weighty object-lessons for his future career.

B. *Outer Conflict.* Nothing gives a more impressive idea of the enormous power which Roman organization had developed, than the fact that she was making her greatest external conquests just in this epoch of inner conflict and disruption. Really she now reaches substantially her imperial limits in Western Asia and in Gaul. Several of the emperors, notably Trajan, will push out the boundaries somewhat further, still the whole remains the Mediterranean world. The two greatest military geniuses that Rome ever produced, not excepting Scipio, belong to the present epoch, Pompey and Cæsar. Leaving out the Spanish conflict of Sertorius, which was partly external, but chiefly internal, we may note the two main fields.

(1) West-Asia had been restless under Roman domination in spite of the strong hand of Sulla. The third war with Mithradates breaks out (74), and for eight years sways backward and forward till at last Pompey is sent (66), and defeats Mithradates at the Euphrates, who proposed to make an expedition across Thrace into

Italy, imitating Hannibal from the other direction. But soon West-Asia lies at Pompey's feet, and he disposes of it as an autocrat without regard to the Senate. Thus he gets his training to one-man power in the East, where it is the only authority known. At last the time comes when he must return to Rome, which after all was the center of the political world. The great question with Rome and with himself was, What next? Pompey was a Sullan, and his career in Asia has been similar to that of Sulla. Both had there received a training to absolutism, and each had behind himself a strong army filled with personal devotion to its leader. Will Pompey, having brought his soldiery home to Italy, repeat Sulla's act at Rome and make himself dictator? There is no doubt that such a result was generally feared if not expected, as Pompey and the Senate, the administrative center of the Roman World, were hostile to each other. Still Pompey did not re-enact the Sullan deed. Why?

In the first place Pompey had seen the futility of the Sullan constitution and had helped to destroy it; he probably questioned the whole Roman career of Sulla. But a deeper ground lay in his own character which represented the dualism of the time. The Great Man of Rome had come to have two contradictory elements, which often made him internally at war with himself. These we can see plainly in Pompey, as in Scipio.

First he was a born Roman, trained by Rome to the rigid subordination of himself to the State (S. P. Q. R.). But secondly he had been endowed with absolute power practically, and sent to Asia, where he remained five years as autocrat. The ominous silence of Pompey when he returned home, in spite of all attempts to probe his secret purpose, suggests the long and doubtful battle within. Then there was a third influence which came upon his balancing mind and finally determined it, so that he dismissed his army at Brundisium, and returned to Rome for his triumph. This influence was Julius Cæsar, who had been a chief supporter of the two laws which had conferred upon him absolute authority in the war against the pirates and against Mithradates. Cæsar was then the main political power in Rome, and was seeking in every way to win Pompey as the man who held the last decision through his soldiers. Cæsar had as yet no military following, which however is soon to appear.

(2) Through the Triumvirate Cæsar obtains Gaul and there develops his talent for command as well as wins the personal devotion of a large body of soldiers, whereby he is on a par with Pompey. He has himself written the story of the reduction of Gaul to Roman sway, and of his two incursions into Britain. It is notable that he marks the limits of Rome in the North, as Pompey marked them in the East. During

eight years (58–50) Cæsar carried on the contest, which was in the end not only to Romanize Gaul, but also to imperialize Rome. At the same time the two Great Men have unfolded into bitter opposition, so that one of them must be suppressed.

C. *Great Men.* Several appear who deserve such a title, but the History of Rome during this epoch hinges upon the career of one Great Man, Cæsar. Born in the year 100 B. C. he had seen as a young man the dictatorship of Sulla, from whom he escaped with some difficulty. Then he had also witnessed the return of Pompey. Political experience he had obtained at Rome, so that he knew well her trouble; we may also suppose that he had made up his mind in reference to what had to be done for her salvation. The one-man power had become apparent as a constituent of Roman government, but still remained outside of it, unacknowledged. Cæsar doubtless felt the insufficiency of Pompey, cleft as the latter was by his dualism: too much of an autocrat to submit to the State, too much of a Roman to subordinate Rome. Clearly he is not the man to make the great transition demanded by the Spirit of the age. It is highly probable that Cæsar saw plainly what was needed when he helped celebrate the triumph of Pompey in 61 B. C. But Cæsar was as yet no military man, and had no army at his back like those

of Pompey and of Sulla, though he was the most astute politician in Rome. He becomes Consul through his political skill, wins Pompey, the Strong Man of the hour, through favorable measures, in spite of the opposition of the Optimates, but chiefly he obtains for himself the two Gauls and Illyria with the command of several legions. In this field he is to gain that marvelous military proficiency of his, after his forty-second year.

The deepest movement of the epoch is the evolution of the one Great Man out of the many small ones and the several considerable ones, who for a time rise to the surface of affairs along with him. The separation of the time shows itself in the two sides: the Roman Senate especially versus the Great Men, the latter in reality controlling the entire State through their personal power. Marius and Cinna and Sulla had each put down the constitutional order by violence; but the Triumvirate is peacefully accepted, upheld through the People against the Senate. Such is the dualism of the time which moves toward unity in the Unumvirate. There are three main steps in this movement, really the chief one of the history of the present epoch lasting some thirty years (78–48).

(1) First is the gathering of all real power into the hands of three Great Men who unite their divergent interests and create the *Triumvirate*. It

took some eighteen years for these three centers of accretion to be formed from the writhing mass called Rome (78–60). We have beheld the Titanic negative energies at work in this same bit of time represented in the strong individuals, Sertorius, Spartacus, and Catiline. The positive counterpart to these three was the said Triumvirate composed of Pompey, Crassus, and Cæsar. The latter was the one who brought it about, reconciling Pompey and Crassus, who had not been friends. Pompey was also in bitter strife with the Senate, and having the People on his side, as well as the might of his soldiery, was leaning toward the subjection, if not suppression of the Senate, thus reversing the act of Sulla. It is likely that the formation of the Triumvirate (usually called the first) prevented civil war. This was Cæsar's great political act: to keep the antagonistic elements of the State from getting into a fight. He had just come from Spain where he had obtained a little military experience, enough to show him that he must have a good deal more if he would rule the unruly elements of his time.

The three Great Men now practically control the Roman world, with a certain formal regard for S. P. Q. R. Cæsar goes to his two Gauls, and there starts to performing his several functions: to subdue and Romanize the ever-threatening Celt on the one hand, and on the other to

develop his military genius, and also to prepare his legions for his coming task. The Triumvirate being made up of ambitious Great Men, begins in four years to show signs of falling asunder, but Cæsar deftly welds it together again at Lucca (56), and there is a new distribution of the world. Pompey gets Spain but he stays at Rome; Crassus with his love of money is bought with the riches of the Orient; but Cæsar holds fast to his present territory, getting, however, another lease of power for five years.

(2) But the process continues and the Triumvirate passes into the *Duumvirate* or two-men power, by the death of Crassus in the East (53). He engages in a war with the Parthians, transcending the bound of the Roman world, against the advice of C. Cassius, his truly Roman quæstor who urges him to keep to the line of the Euphrates. But the fated line is transgressed and the Roman army is totally destroyed except a few rescued by this same Cassius (who by the way is Shakespeare's Cassius).

Thus Pompey and Cæsar remain without the third person. Moreover their tie had been loosened by the death of Julia (54), Cæsar's daughter, who was the wife of Pompey. A number of occurrences showed that Pompey, who kept still at Rome, was turning away from Cæsar's friends, and had begun to be reconciled with the Senate. At last the Senate outlawed Cæsar,

and empowered Pompey to defend the Republic. News came to Cæsar at Ravenna, and with one legion he made the famous passage of the Rubicon out of his Province into Italy, whereat he uttered his famous declaration *Jacta alea est*, according to Suetonius.

Thus the Duumvirate has reached its natural outcome in the antagonism of the two Great Men and of their parties, which means civil war. Pompey is driven out of Italy, is defeated in the battle of Pharsalia (48) and perishes shortly afterwards in Egypt. So the Duumvirate has evolved into a one-man power, which has been lurking in the whole epoch.

Pompey in the deepest view of his character, must be deemed the victim of his own inner dualism, which simply expressed itself in his tragic fate. When he dismissed his forces at Brundisium, he acted the part of a good Roman republican, but threw away the future. In Asia he could be the autocratic Great Man, being surrounded by Asiatic traditions, but at Rome he renounced his greatness. His conduct there, accordingly, is an ever-recurring dubitation, a continual oscillating from one side to the other. Thus he shows himself not the man for the time. No such spiritual dualism do we find in Cæsar, who through all his conduct, from the forming of the first Triumvirate to the crossing of the Rubicon, reveals an inner unity of purpose,

which is to add Monarchos to Republican Rome, and which is the call of the World-Spirit, as well as the deepest trend of the Roman Folk-Soul at present.

(3) The *Unumvirate* manifests its presence with the death of Pompey, but it has still to realize itself by uniting the whole Roman world under the one-man power. Can it hold together the vast Mediterranean circle of nations, which is showing at numerous points a tendency to break to pieces? The three continents joined under Roman sway seem to be falling asunder. Wonderful is the activity of Cæsar in this far-reaching crisis. He hurries to Egypt where he becomes involved in the so-called Alexandrine War, which after some trouble he brings to a victorious conclusion (this was the time of his episode with Cleopatra). Then he flies back to Italy and settles political matters at Rome, suppressing also a mutiny among the soldiers (47). Returns to Asia where he puts down Pharnaces at the battle of Zela, in Pontus, and saves to Rome the Orient. Meanwhile in Africa war has broken out, which he concludes triumphantly at Thapsus (46). In the same year the Spanish war is stirred up by the Pompeians who are defeated at Munda (45), and an end is made of the tri-continental civil conflict.

Thus the one-man power has asserted itself tremendously, having in its deed taken the place

of Rome (S. P. Q. R.), and re-subjected to itself the Mediterranean world with the three continents. We see that the present epoch is a movement of the successive stages—Triumvirate, Duumvirate, and Unumvirate—each of which has shown itself to be a power realizing itself through yet over the Roman State. Still this power finds its self-consistency and unity in the one person—Cæsar.

We are to note that through his act the Provincials have marched to Rome and subordinated it, and then from it as center have marched back to the Provinces and have reduced them to the new Rome, which is really now their own. Such is the round of Cæsar with his Provincials, of whom his legions are largely composed, associating Rome, provincializing it in a sense. Strangely his enemies, the Pompeians, seek to stir Spain and other Provinces to do what he has done. Yet the latter are thus fighting for the Senate and the Republic which subjected them, and will keep them in subjection against Cæsar, who proposes to have them share in Roman government. His rapid victories over the Pompeian Provincials are, accordingly, the victories over peoples who are chiefly fighting against themselves.

Still this Provincial Association of Rome by Cæsar is external and he knows the fact. How can it be made internal, a part of Rome herself?

Certainly Asssociation is not to be seized from the outside, by violence. Moreover in this way the Provinces are set over against Rome, and also Italy. Provincial Association alone is not enough, it does not get what it seeks, namely the associative power of Rome. And their leader Cæsar, who has brought them to Rome and given them of Rome, is not to be left outside, but is to become a part of the Roman Constitution. That is, the one-man power must be made constitutional. Thereby Rome will be internally associated by and with the Provinces, imparting to them the rights which she has hitherto kept for herself.

Thus Roman History passes in its evolution from a Provincial Association to the World's Association of the same, which embraces not only the Province, but Italy and also Rome herself. Such is now the totality of the Roman World—Provincial, Italian, Roman—which is proceeding to a new self-association, far wider than that original communal one (see preceding pp. 437–9). As the little town on the banks of the Tiber once associated itself at the beginning, so now when it has become the World, we are to witness essentially the same process gradually unfolding in the Empire.

III.

The World's Association of Rome.

So we designate the third and concluding Epoch of Rome's third Period. The latter, having unfolded out of the Italic and the Provincial Association of Rome, now completes itself, not merely through war and external subjection, but through the inner constitutional transformation of Rome into the Empire. The third element of the governmental process, the Great Man who has long been the real ruler, quite unsubordinated to S. P. Q. R., though often acting through it formally, now makes himself explicitly Monarchos under the name of Dictator and Imperator. Thus the Roman Constitution is transformed from the Republic which really had as explicit only the two constituents, Demos and Aristos. These two elements Cæsar and after him Augustus still retain, not as independent and co-ordinate with the one Will, but rather as its instruments of government which are already made and in operation, and to which the governed are accustomed.

It is plain that this third Epoch has gone back to the first, that of the kings, whose element (Monarchos) long expelled or suppressed, is now supplied once more. Thus Roman History is completing its great cycle. We may also here

note a lesser return upon itself, namely to the first Epoch of the present (third) Period. The association of Rome by the World, starting as Italic, has gone forward till it begins to embrace the whole Mediterranean territory, and thus rounds itself out, or at least shows that such will be its outcome. Still the Sullan movement of that same period was a turning-back, not to the kings but to the beginning of the Republic with its aristocratic or Senatorial supremacy. Moreover Sulla, like Cæsar, openly acted as Monarchos, and changed the constitution, but he changed it backward instead of forward, having eliminated from it just his own monarchic self, which was the thing that time had evolved. This was a great piece of self-stultification, which Cæsar criticised in Sulla, as reported by Suetonius.

Accordingly we are to see that the entire third Period (133–31) with its three Epochs or stages is one mighty struggle between the Great Individual and the Roman State as Republic headed chiefly by the Senate. We are to look into the ground of this struggle. Rome has associated the World by conquering and governing its nations, tribes, communities. She has done this from herself outward; she cannot so easily reverse the wheels of her movement, whisk about, and be governed and determined by her own subject nations, tribes and communities, which, having been associated by her, must now associ-

ate her, according to her own deepest principle made universal. How, then, is this great transition, now pressing upon Rome with the might of the World-Spirit, to be accomplished? By what means can the governmental machine be altered to do its opposite? Only through the one Mind which knows and can act through itself. In fact we have seen Rome evolve already several of these Minds to perform various stages of the change.

If Rome as S. P. Q. R. is powerless to make the grand transition, equally so is the World as her associated domain. The conquered cannot of themselves conquer their conqueror, nor can the associated of themselves associate their associator. Here again is seen the need of the Roman Great Man to lead them to Rome not alone externally but internally; he knowing and sharing in both sides is the bridge uniting both Rome and her Rim of peoples. So Cæsar, having trained his Provincials, will march them to the central city, and then associate them institutionally with the same. Participators they must be finally in what associated them. Even the enemies of Cæsar, the Pompeians and supporters of the ancient Constitution, also went to Provinces, Spain and Africa for instance, in order to pass thence to Rome for restoring old S. P. Q. R. which really moved the other way. Contradictory was their attempt, seeking to make the conquered re-

store their conqueror. We have seen Cæsar rushing to various points of the Rim—East, West, South—from his new Rome, which has begun to be provincialized, in order to secure not only the Provinces to Rome, but also Rome to the Provinces.

Undoubtedly this final Roman act is done from the outside, by a single Will. It is thus an autocratic deed, not the work of the Provincials or of the Romans through themselves, of their own election. Both are in a sense compelled to associate together and form the new State by the Great Man, who mediates them with the incoming order of the World-Spirit. Thus he is truly the Imperator (Emperor) commanding the two antagonistic elements to coalesce and moulding them into their higher unity. It is true that this unity lay in both sides, Roman and Provincial, but was implicit, undeveloped, and could not come to reality by its own innate power. To share in the government which they obeyed was a strong instinct in Italians and Provincials, as we see by their long-continued attempts to obtain such participation. Still they could not without their Great Man, whose supreme function it is to mediate that dumb unconscious Folk-Soul with the World-Spirit, and thereby make it real, historical, yea world-historical (see preceding pp. 58–61). At the same time we now can see the limitation of the mighty Cæsarian deed; the

ultimate, which means the self-rule literally, should be inside the People themselves, not outside in a single irresponsible Will. But such an explicit self-governing act of the People will be a long time in coming, though it will come, indeed has come. Still the transition from republican to imperial Rome is a step toward a more complete self-government on the part of those governed, in spite of the many Roman declarations against it, prating of the lost liberty and echoed in numberless modern repetitions.

In the present Epoch we are to note especially the striking fact that Monarchies is evolved twice in the same way, through the Triumvirate. The repetition of the process gives a new and emphatic meaning to it; the idea of Cæsar can and must prevail even without the individual Cæsar, who perishes.

There are three stages of Cæsar's life, each of which was an element not merely of himself, but of his city and of his age. (1.) The first and longest part of his career was political. He came to know Rome better than any man of his time. He studied her defects, maladies, limitations, and excogitated the remedies. He manipulated the republican City-State, and knew that the great transition had to come. This basic acquaintance with Rome herself is what underlies Cæsar's work. (2.) Then came the military part of Cæsar's career, particularly in Gaul. He

saw that he could do nothing without an army which was to be trained by him on the border till he was ready to march with it to Rome. He saw that the new order was to come from the Provinces to the central city, and transform that. (3) This transformation is his supreme act, in which he seeks to add the newly-risen power, the Monarchos, to the Roman Constitution. Only thus could Rome be saved and be brought to complete her work of association. Through the Provinces Cæsar, as pro-consular autocrat, imperializes Rome, from which he can then reform and associate anew these Provinces.

He was aware from his own experience, particularly in Spain, that provincial Governors must be deprived of their imperial authority and subjected to law, wherein lay the great task of the Empire. He must stop others from doing what he has done, from playing his trick against him and his new order. So he uses pro-consular authority to do away with pro-consular authority, and to have one imperator at the center and not many scattered over the Roman World. He makes himself, or his supreme deed, a permanent part of the Constitution.

And now we are to witness this final act of the World associating Rome compulsorily, which is also the final act of the Republic. For the Republic, true to its character, fights such incoming association and fights the Great Man who

enforces the same. But Rome has to take up him and his idea not merely externally but internally, into her Constitution, thereby passing into the Empire. This last process of a great world-historical State we shall briefly characterize.

A. *The Inner Conflict.* Cæsar begins to transform Rome internally, to break down its Republican exclusiveness and Patrician pride, so that it can be associated by the World, which is now to participate in Roman government. This of course leads to bitter opposition and conflict. For the Roman spirit still lives, which is that of conquering and associating under its sway the rest of mankind. But the time has come when the rest of mankind, or the Mediterranean portion thereof, is going to return the Roman favor (and a great one it was) by associating Rome with itself. So we must grasp and formulate the two sides of the inner conflict of this time: the World's association of Rome versus Rome's association of the World. It is the conflict of the old with the new order. Cæsar's position we note in the fact that he is first made Dictator for a year, then for ten years, and finally for life (45). At the same time he received the title Imperator, with the right of appointing all the Magistrates hitherto chosen by the People.

During his two brief stays at Rome, between 46–44 B. C., he was occupied with his new civil

regulations. The amount as well as the quanty of the work done is astounding; but we must recollect that Cæsar was primarily a political man and knew the Roman State in all its weak spots through his early experience. His reforms had long been thought out and were now enacted with absolute authority. We may briefly note the main ones.

(1) First and foremost Cæsar conferred the Roman franchise upon many Provincials for the first time. All the cities of Transpadine Gaul and many in Transalpine Gaul and Spain obtained citizenship. That was merely his start. He had planned to confer the Latin franchise upon Sicily. Clearly his intention was to make gradually the Provincials into Roman citizens. Such a purpose strikes the key-note of his whole career and reveals the deepest trend of the age. To be sure the measure rouses the jealousy not only of the old Romans, but even of some Italians, who, however, are pacified by Cæsar with the loaves and fishes of the chief offices.

(2) The Senate he completely transformed in the same spirit, raising the number of its members to 900, among whom were not a few Provincials, especially Gauls, some of whom spoke a broken Latin. Then he increased by fiat the number of Patricians. At the same time he limited the power of the Senate, which no longer administered the Provinces for the benefit of its par-

ticular members, who were sent out as governors to enrich themselves. Cæsar brought the government of the Provinces under law and strict accountability, and otherwise regulated the Civil Service. He started to rebuild the great Provincial cities of Corinth and Carthage, which had been destroyed by the commercial jealousy of the central City-State. Thus both People and Senate, the old S. P. Q. R. he has transformed, having in a measure provincialized them, so that the Provincials are getting to participate in the government at the center.

(3) Cæsar himself becomes a part (if not more) of the Roman State, restoring the one-man power to the governmental process. Monarchos has indeed returned with surpassing might which overshadows both Demos and Aristos. Still these are allowed to live and to perform a function, though subordinate in the new political organism. The right of Imperator is made transmissible by inheritance. The new order is to be permanent. Cæsar makes his deed an element of the constitution, he does not eliminate himself, as did Sulla.

Other personally autocratic deeds, beneficial to the total Empire are recorded of him. He seeks to check the Roman populace by cutting down the free distribution of corn one-half. He is said to have established the first Public Library. Famous is his reform of the calendar.

By his absolute will he prolonged the year 46–45 B. C. to 445 days, thus bringing the solar and the civil year into harmony.

But old Rome rises up and slays the individual Cæsar (44 B. C.). Now does the new order depend on an individual? Can the idea be stabbed to death in the Senate House? Such is the chief problem which Cæsar's assassination brings up and which is next to be settled.

B. *Outer Conflict.* Brutus and Cassius are driven out of the city; the Senatorial assassins of Cæsar flee to the East, to the Provinces, from which they hope to return to the center. Old Rome has to run from new Rome, and seeks to win the Provincials so that these restore to authority their conquerors and indeed oppressors. So too did Pompey. Hardly will the enslaved fight for those who enslaved them against their liberator. How can the Provincials favor the Senate and its principle against Cæsar and his principle? Yet the conspirators base their hope upon such an absurdity, repeating Pompey.

It is to be noticed that old Rome with its party, having separated from the central city and Italy, puts itself outside, and becomes an external foe with whom is the outer conflict.

Both sides, the Senatorial and the Cæsarian, had much trouble in getting themselves adjusted for the coming struggle. Particularly the party of Cæsar is thrown into great confusion by the

rival claims of Antony and Octavius. At last in the year 42 the representatives of the two conflicting ideas meet at Philippi and the old Roman party is defeated. Thus Cæsar's principle is victorious without Cæsar. Or as legend and poetry put it, Cæsar's spirit wins its triumph. (See Plutarch and especially Shakespeare). It is now decided that Rome will not go backward. But it is by no means settled in what way she is going forward to realize the idea of Cæsar. The victorious party, divided by faction, must next pass through a process of unification.

C. *Great Men.* It will have to be acknowledged that the Great Men of this Epoch are such hardly in their own right, but as heirs of another's greatness. They are laden with the principle of Cæsar, which they have to defend against external assault as well as to unfold internally to its complete realization. The problem runs: The individual Cæsar being eliminated, can another individual be evolved to take his place? If so, then his work will show a new power and greatness; it will approve itself not merely as his, or as an individual matter, but as universal. It will bear the stamp of the World-Spirit, who, if one instrument fails, is certain to find another.

The chief historic interest, then, is to see the time evolving another Cæsar by its own inner necessity, the first one having been removed. The curious fact will come to light that this

second evolution will be almost a repetition of the original evolution of Cæsar himself as Monarchos. The movement is again from many to one through three and two. That is, out of a mass of individuals, each of them more or less important, but all struggling to step into Cæsar's shoes, we shall behold the Triumvirate first arise, then pass into a Duumvirate, which will end in a Unumvirate once more and finally. This is the movement we saw evolving Cæsar in the last Epoch. But now not only in his idea re-affirmed, but the very process of it reproduced by the Spirit of the Age.

(1) First then, out of the many claimants under one pretext or other, to Cæsar's heirship (we might name it by analogy a *Multumvirate*), there comes forth the three-men power over the Roman State, the so-called second *Triumvirate*, consisting of Antony, Lepidus, and Octavius (43). Already there had been civil war; both Antony and Octavius claimed the inheritance. They are reconciled temporarily by Lepidus, and then the next year the *Triumvirate* performs its chief function in gaining the battle of Philippi and suppressing the old Roman party. That is the end, in fact the second end of Republic. The Triumvirate is now victorious, but it too is only transitional, and begins its dissolution or rather evolution.

(2) It was evident from the start that the two

real men of the time were Antony and Octavius. Moreover Antony goes East where he becomes infatuated with the Greco-Oriental beauty, Cleopatra. But Octavius stays in the West, where he has many conflicts in putting down all the refractory elements. Several times the world has to be re-divided between the Triumvirs, and peace between them secured by new compacts. So it runs till Lepidus is eliminated by Octavius (36). Practically now there are two empires, the Roman (in the West) and the Hellenistic (in the East). So the Duumvirate becomes the great fact, each side having its wars with the adjoining nations. After some four years the Senate declares war against Cleopatra. It is evident that Octavius has been busy in preparing himself for the final struggle which he knew had to come, if Cæsar's idea were to be realized. Antony has in fact surrendered his Roman heritage and turned Oriental. All of which is vividly imaged by the battle of Actium (31) in which he is totally defeated by Octavius, and flees back to Egypt where he kills himself.

(3) Again the *Unumvirate* has emerged from that seething Roman world. The second Cæsar has appeared, the legal heir of the first, but what is most important, the spiritual successor of mighty Cæsar. But he has first to reduce the East to his sway. After founding Nicopolis in honor of his victory, he reaches Egypt the next

year (30) which he easily conquers. Cleopatra tries upon him her sensuous blandishments which not only undid Antony, but for awhile (according to rumor) bewitched his great uncle, Julius. But Octavius is beauty-proof, she gives up and commits suicide. This conquest of Cleopatra must be deemed the greatest victory that Octavius ever won, for Actium was a weak fight against him.

Octavius returns to Rome the autocrat of the Mediterranean World, and in 29 B. C. celebrates a triple triumph, imitating therein his uncle. But his most significant typical act is that he closed the temple of Janus, the Roman War-God, for the first time in more than two hundred years (last closed in 235 B. C.). The Empire has come and its trend has been indicated.

The many details accompanying this great change cannot here be even alluded to. But we must see the main process of it. Primarily to the Constitution of Rome was to be added the one-man power; over Demos and Aristos there was to appear a supreme Monarchos; into old S. P. Q. R was to be introduced the new Imperator. The one supereminent Will we have already seen repeatedly outside the Constitution; now it is to be put inside, and to be made organic in its process. This, we say, is the chief task of Octavius. Moreover such a change, to be truly organic, has to grow and become gradually

incorporate in the body politic. It cannot be done at a stroke. The careful, long-lived Octavius was just the man to oversee and nurse this crescent State.

Octavius was the pivotal mind through which the Republic was slowly transmuted into the Empire as an explicit form of government, completely organized, successfully functioning, and permanent. Undoubtedly it had been a long time on the way, in a sense from the beginning of Rome. With Julius Cæsar we may say that the idea of it was born and showed itself in a clear, definite outline. But it was Octavius who realized this Cæsarian idea. During his long supremacy of forty-four years, he made a revolutionary product institutional, and through it restored peace to the world; the association, which was once extorted from Rome, becomes through him her voluntary gift.

How did he bring about this grand political metamorphosis? First of all the scattered individual powers of the Roman State he unites in himself. There were mainly three: (1) the pro-consular authority, which came from the government of the Provinces, and was substantially autocratic; (2) the consular power, which gave him control over Rome and Italy; (3) the tribunician power, which conferred upon him the veto (*intercessio*), the negative might of the People over all the laws and functions of the State. Previously in the Republic these three

powers were derived from S. P. Q. R., but now quite the reverse is the case. But what shall this new addition be named? Octavius shunned the title of king and dictator, and even imperator he did not like; all these told too plainly the truth, and were unpopular with the genuine old Roman as savoring of personal rule. The point was to conceal the reality as much as possible. So Octavius dug up a new title then quite colorless, calling himself *Princeps*, and his peculiar government was the *Principatus*. But whatever it may be called, it is evident that the third element, the Monarchos, has entered the hitherto dual Roman Constitution, and is decidedly dominating the other two elements, Senate and People, using them simply as its forms, its instruments. The assembly of the People is employed by Octavius for the form of law-making but is of course very inadequate for such purpose, as the Roman People are now scattered all over Italy and the World. The Senate as a limited body of men at Rome, is more utilizable, especially for the purpose of administration; hence Octavius, after purging the Senate and reducing its number to 600, makes much use of it and assigns to it considerable powers. But it has no equal or independent share in the government outside of the will of the Monarchos; hence it is wholly inept to call the rule of Octavius a dyarchy, as some recent writers, especially German, have done. The

whole essence of it is the return and restoration of the Monarchos in the Roman State.

It is true that Octavius concealed, or sought to conceal all his changes in old forms and called them, where he could, by old names. Indeed legal forms and fictions begin to have a significance and a currency hitherto unparalleled. The Roman lawyer, perhaps the greatest of his kind, begins now to evolve in his full glory, and continues to flourish under the Empire till he perhaps culminates in the age of Justinian. Old S. P. Q. R. still lives but as a phantom and doing the work of a phantom, at the bidding of the real living Monarchos. Octavius or Augustus claims to have restored the Republic, and makes a pretense of reacting against the work of his uncle, Julius Cæsar. In what have been supposed to be his own words (the inscription known as *Monumentum Ancyranum*) he declares that he had no more power than his fellow rulers.

Still the real, world-historical fact of him and his time is that a personality, a Self, an Ego enters the process of the Roman State and controls the same and keeps it under control till the new Constitution becomes the settled working principle not only of the old City-State but of the whole Mediterranean World. Such is the pivotal turn from Republic to Empire, which we have seen to be also a return to the originative form of Rome herself, and in this regard to be the completion of her historic cycle.

This return is not only personal, from Monarchos to Monarchos, but embraces the entire activity of the political institution. The primal function of the early Roman community we designated as Self-Association (see First Period); thence it passed to World-Association which now returns to Self-Association. That is, the World as empire is to associate itself, through the one Will; Province, Italy, and Rome are getting to be one, and to share in one governmental process. Rome having long pushed outward in her conquests, is brought back to herself by Cæsar to associate herself anew. Undoubtedly this is at first done externally by the Great Man, who, however, will soon make himself internal in S. P. Q. R. We may therefore say that Rome returns to Rome and associates her with her own—whereby the Republic begins to pass into the Empire. As the early Roman community started with Self-Association of its three ethnic elements, so the Roman Republic winds up with the Self-Association of the World. Therewith the Roman World becomes self-governing, of course through the one-man power, wherein lies just its deepest contradiction.

Thus the new Rome is not merely a going backward upon itself, but a going forward to its greater self, and so it enters upon a fresh evolution, the imperial. This is what is next to be considered.

3. *EMPIRE.*

The general movement of the Roman Empire is opposite to that of the Roman Republic, as regards the fundamental principle, Association. Already Augustus began to do away with the great variety of political relations which subsisted between Rome and her different dependencies. The grand distinction between Italy and the Provinces, and the manifold lesser distinctions between communities and nations as regards rights are gradually to be eliminated in the course of Imperial History. In other words Roman Association is now to become essentially homogenous, instead of being heterogenous as it was during the Republic. Previously it sought difference, but now it seeks uniformity.

Already we have noted that the Republic as-

sociated its allied and conquered cities, tribes and states not after one common scheme, but each in a different way. The result was a gradation of political condition from complete subjection and even destruction up to communities endowed with Roman citizenship. This was the famous policy of Rome; all the units had to be associated through her, yet each by its own special tie, so that combination against her grew to be very difficult. Probably she first became fully aware of this method of association during the Latin War, when she broke up all inter-communal relations between the Latin towns, and conjoined them with herself, though in different degrees of closeness. The same policy essentially she continued during her republican time, applying it to Italy, and in parts to her Mediterranean possessions.

Now it was this policy, or this form of Association that the Empire proceeded slowly to reverse. Those inter-communal ties which republican Rome sought to supplant, are now permitted to grow again, indeed are fostered by some of the Emperors. So exacting was the Republic that it often did not allow intermarriage and inter-commercial relations between its associated towns (*connubium et commercium*), thus directing into given channels both the Family and the Economic Order, prescribing with whom marriage might be contracted, and business might be con-

ducted. Very subtle was such interference with man's most intimate relations, but perhaps necessary for that dissociated Italian land. It is the great discipline that trains association into the separated political atoms, which are to become associative in themselves through such a long and severe schooling. The Roman Empire has reached the point at which it begins to turn these externally associated communities and peoples over to themselves, and to start them in a career of self-association. Augustus grants inner autonomy to certain subject cities and states, equalizing them with those which already have it. Previously Julius Cæsar sought to develop an active municipal life in towns through a greater local self-government. Citizenship was freely distributed, though not made universal till the edict of Caracalla. Thus we see that the imperial tendency is to impart the Roman self-association which has done its one-sided work, and must now be shared by other communities, yea by the world. Out of the one Rome must be born many Romes. Thus her children get to participate in her fundamental character, that of association, which is finally to be given away. We say that this is the general movement and spirit of the Empire, though the opposite or republican element of foreign conquest remains long and continues its activity on the Rim, which is extended to its widest reach under the Em-

peror Trajan. Thus Rome continues her external conflicts in the imperial time, but she substantially attains her territorial outline during the Republic, and then begins a new world-historical function.

The reader will recall that the first great Period of Rome's republican History was designated as self-association (p. 437), which began by the conjunction of her three original communities, Latin, Sabine, and Etruscan, and continued till all her consanguine peoples were united with her in one State. Then this one State became world-associating, and subordinated the Mediterranean circle of lands to itself. Now the Empire in a manner goes back to the original self-association of Rome, and imparts it to the world which she has externally and compulsorily associated. That, we say, is the drift of the Empire, its world-historical purpose, its deepest spirit. Now this spirit is what orders the Empire historically, putting it into its place as the third stage of the total movement of political antiquity. Republican association we have already noted as heterogeneous, separative, insisting upon difference; but imperial association moves the other way, toward uniformity and equality of the associated cities and peoples, which are ultimately to be one and alike in the imparted boon of self-association, even if this never approaches completeness in the Roman world.

I. The History of the Empire has the same political form which we have already seen in Hellas and in Republican Rome—the City-State. This is now to pass through its final world-historical stage in antiquity. It has shown itself capable of uniting and associating a vast territory containing many kinds of communities, tribes and nations; now it is to show itself capable of conferring its associative power upon those whom it has united. In general the Greek City-State politically clung to its own communal limits, making its walls the bounds of its world; the Roman City-State reached out and took in the world, associating the same with itself; the Imperial City-State has the tendency to restore the original communal independence internally, adding somewhat of its own associative power. We have seen the Republican City-State taking the world to itself, next we are to see the Imperial City-State giving itself, its boon, back to the world. Thus the Empire even with all its personal horrors, bears in it a character and feeling of restoration; it is a kind of political return to a former condition of communal freedom, which Republican Rome had suppressed.

Hence comes the peculiar fact that the Roman Empire has within itself such a decided movement back to Greece, as its salvation. Constantine, the Great Man of the imperial ages, saw this and removed the Capital to a Greek

City, Byzantium, and made it the center of a new Greco-Roman Empire, which lasted more than a thousand years. But long before the founding of Constantinople, the sweep back to Hellas was strongly felt in the Empire. Hadrian already thought of removing the imperial Capital to some Greek city, and he kept away from Rome during a large part of his reign. It is indeed a striking psychical phenomenon of the age: the Roman soul has come to feel that Rome must get out of Rome in order to save Rome. But whither go? Return to Greece, to the Hellenic City-State, which begat such intellectual wonders, but which lacked associative power. This power Rome has now furnished to it through a long training, which, however, is coming to a close. Greece from the start had the love of imparting her spiritual treasures, and has imparted them to Rome, who has gotten the longing to go back to their source, bearing her peculiar boon, association. Thus the Imperial City-State has within itself as its deepest spiritual strain the return to the Hellenic City-State, which is to be renewed and restored to the world with its added Roman endowment.

It will be recollected that the ancient world began with the City-State of Hellas as the first political form of Europe in its development out of barbarism, or we may also say, out of the old ethnic protoplasm of Aryan peoples who had migrated

originally from Asia (see preceding pp. 36-40). It was this City-State which had made the great separation of Europe from the Orient, especially in the Persian War, and thus had begun the World's History as a conscious recorded act of the race. It is to this European beginning of herself that Rome as imperial wishes to return, thus completing the grand historic cycle of antiquity, of which she has come to feel herself but a part. Thus the antique City-State, the bearer of Mediterranean civilization, rounds out its world-historical career, and at the same time begins, or rather has begun, an entirely new Period of European History.

In this way we bring before ourselves the mighty sweep called Ancient History, through its three forms of City-States, Hellenic, Roman, Imperial. Each of these forms we see going through its own special process and indeed many processes, yet each is also to be grasped as a stage of the one greater process including them all, which we may call the Psychosis of historic Antiquity.

II. And now we may cast a glance at the reverse side of the picture. There is no doubt that a deeply negative element is interwoven in this new movement of Imperial Rome, which sweeps toward complete disorganization and destruction. There is and must be an undoing of the Republic from top to bottom, through the Empire and its tendency. The Roman principle

of association begins to be counteracted, the ties which connected the world with the central city are slowly shorn in twain. The result is a decided lurch toward dissociation which primarily means dissolution. The Roman Empire is a grand panorama of a whole world going to pieces. But this, we must always remember, is its negative side, to which there is an emphatic, positive counterpart, which has been already indicated.

Rome as Empire is, therefore, no longer associating the world, but is dissociating it—resolving it back, or permitting it to be resolved back, into its original societary units, communal, tribal, national. We saw her as Republic undoing inter-communal, inter-tribal and inter-national relations, and making herself the associative center of the world; but all that is now reversed, and her present bent is that her former undoing be itself undone. She restores previous political units and gives to them her rights, even the right of association. Finally she gives her whole self, yea her Capital, through an Emperor, to another city which also becomes a central power. We do not say that she does this act of self-abnegation without a struggle, without many a qualm of reaction at her departing supremacy and glory. Rome as republican is the City-State of all City-States; she is the Sun of the Mediterranean world whose political bodies are everywhere flying toward her with their move-

ments subdued by her to a cosmical order. But Rome as imperial works no longer with a centripetal but with a centrifugal energy; her vast system of associated units is reactionary against the center with no small degree of individual self-assertion, whereby the previous cosmos seems rushing into chaos. An associative civilization is certainly in a mighty decadence, as it sweeps toward dissociation and breaks those institutional ties which first unified the world and then held it together.

Now this decadent tragic side of imperial Rome is what has attracted the almost exclusive attention of Historians. It so happens that two of the greatest historical writers that ever lived were drawn by temperament and training to this melancholy theme of a decadent world, and portrayed the negative side of it with such fullness and power that the positive element lurking and working in the grand transformation has quite sunk out of the ken of recorded History. Tacitus was born in Nero's time, and as a man could look back upon the enormities of the later Cæsars. There runs through his style and his world-view an oppressive feeling of Roman deterioration under the Empire. We may excuse him, for he lived and wrote amid the first decided symptoms of the dissolving process of the imperial city. Hence we always hear the undertone of a settled world-pain in a great soul,

and this feeling he has imparted to eighteen centuries of readers. Such is the ancient historian; his modern counterpart is Gibbon, whose *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* by its very title suggests the negative standpoint of the author. Moreover Gibbon was the child of his time, of that reactionary, destructive Eighteenth Century which culminated in the French Revolution. There is no doubt about the greatness of Gibbon as mirroring in himself not only Rome but his own age. Three things we study together in Gibbon: his pungent individuality, the spirit of his time, and Roman Imperial History. Christianity, the saving principle of that old decadent world, he sees and portrays only in its negative aspect, for this is not wanting in reality. So he translates the universe into Gibbonese—which is for us one of his chief merits, even if it must be transcended. Europe has very generally read his work, with its vast sweep of erudition, its great organizing power, and its stylistic grandeur, and through it has largely absorbed the Historian's view of the Roman Empire. But in our own time and land, Gibbon must be corrected not simply in regard to his facts and special views (which Guizot, Milman and others have done), but also in the far larger matter of supplementing his Decline and Fall with the positive, constructive, evolving

element of the Roman Empire, whereby it becomes truly world-historical.

III. Territorially the Roman Empire remains tri-continental till the conclusion of its ancient life. That is, it embraces the parts of three continents, Europe, Asia, and Africa, lying around the Mediterranean. Though it divides within itself politically into an Eastern and a Western State, both will call themselves Roman, and will claim the tri-continental inheritance. History at first does not seize an entire continent by itself, but takes a slice from each of the three which are connected by the great Midland Sea. Circummarine we have already called its circle of territories, the seat of ancient civilization. Moreover when the political bond is unknotted, and the old Roman association becomes a kind of dissociation, a new and deeper tie will be born in the hearts of the Mediterranean peoples, that of the Christian religion, which will show a stronger and more pervasive associative power than Rome. For Christianity will cross the Roman Rim and take the barbarians also into its fold of association, thereby getting possession of total Europe in time.

Frequently we have alluded to this Roman Rim or border of Barbary, which the Republic pushed out almost to its final delimitation, though not quite. The Empire kept up theoretically the principle of territorial extension, but on the

whole its chief struggle was to maintain the Rim against the surges of the barbarous invaders, who at last broke over. In general the Republic was a mighty outer sweep of conquest and of world-association, while the Empire was dominantly a time of inner conflict and of the transformation of individual, society and State, but especially of religion. When the secular world was falling to pieces, it was the common religion which held the two Romes together, and could even associate with them their barbarous assailants. It is true that religion also had its inner troubles, its schisms and heresies, and finally its great separation into East and West. But there can be no doubt that in the critical moment, peculiarly about the time of Constantine, political disintegration of the Roman world was met and largely overcome by religious integration working in the souls of men.

Still the epoch-turning moment comes when this great religious unity, organized into an institution, the Church, is smitten in twain by a world- separating blow, and it is this blow which brings to an end antiquity. Mahommedanism appears in West-Asia, assailing and dividing the hitherto one religion of the Roman Empire. At the same time this deep inner division manifests its outer spatial character in a complete and permanent bi-section of the Mediterranean circle of peoples. Asia and Africa largely fall away from

the Roman Empire and Christianity, while Europe still clings to both. A Northern and a Southern segment of the vast circummarine oval of Nations is seen to be the territorial basis of a new stage of the World's History. It is at this great separation, inner and outer, that the Medieval Period opens and the Ancient World ends. Besides the political and the religious difference, there is another which reached fully as deep: that of race. The Semite of West-Asia rises up against the dominant Aryan of Europe, and founds his own empire and religion.

IV. So it comes that Orient and Occident have again renewed, under a changed form, that old conflict, which we have already seen opening if not producing History. Indeed it is the same two continental peoples, the Greek and the Asiatic, who have once more grappled on the arena of the World's History, though the Asiatic this time is not the Persian but the Saracen. In such a way we are to behold the cycle of historic antiquity completed, with its three stages also rounded out—Hellas, Rome, and Empire. It is true that Byzantium, the heir of the Empire and calling itself by this name, will continue the conflict with the East all through the Middle Ages. But that is the second grand Period of European History which we shall see to rest upon the foregoing political, religious, and racial separation.

Thus the Roman Empire in its third stage goes back to the struggle between the Orient and Hellas which starts European History. But there is another return to the beginning which should not be omitted. We saw both Hellas and Rome rising out of the vast mass of barbarous peoples called the Ethnic Protoplasm, from which the ancient civilized nations were gradually evolved. Now the Roman Empire embracing these civilized nations, is to receive a fresh baptism in this Ethnic Protoplasm in order that an old decayed world may be rejuvenated from its original fountain of youth even if barbarous. Such is clearly the decree of the World-Spirit in whose overarching historic scheme the much-abused barbarians of the North, who first overflowed and then overthrew the Roman Empire in the West, are to be included.

The fact is that these two different kinds of return to its primordial source will divide the Roman Empire into an Eastern and Western. The Eastern Empire becomes Greek and remains so for many centuries; the civilized City-State goes back to the people and land which started it, taking with it Roman association which supplants the old Greek political dissociation, and also organizing the new religion into the State as an additional associative bond. The Western Empire as Latin is overwhelmed and partitioned by the Northern barbarians, or we may say, is

plunged into the seething maelstrom of Ethnic Protoplasm, so that it becomes Teutonized and is finally made into a great Teutonic Empire. Thus during the whole Medieval Period Europe itself is divided into an Eastern and Western portion, the second of which has taken the deeper dip backward in the original well-head of peoples.

In this way we catch a glimpse of the separative, dissociative tendency which began its work with the beginning of the Empire. This in spite of its oneness, or the Henarchy which was the work of the Republic, was dissolving, and so moving toward the European Polyarchy which exists to-day. Still the associative bond of republican Rome was not lost, but was ideally preserved in the Roman Law, whose sway has not yet wholly lapsed. Hellas we have already named polynomous, since each City-State had its own law for its own people. But republican Rome associating many communities and nations, had one law-giving source, was externally mononomous, even if its application of the law was unequal. The result was seen in a vast number of laws expressing different kinds and degrees of association (Jus Latinum, Jus Italicum, etc.). But the tendency of the Empire was to eliminate this inequality of the Law and to make it truly universal, as the vehicle of equal and impartial justice to all. Necessarily the many discriminations of Roman Law will disappear with their

origin, namely the diverse association so often remarked as the peculiar policy of the Republic. Finally comes the codification of Justinian, the concluding act of unifying and organizing the Roman Law, whereby Rome becomes truly mononomous internally as well as externally; each nation, community, individual is to get its own (*suum cuique*), and all are to be treated alike. This ideal of universal Justice with a very considerable if not complete realization, is one of the chief boons which the Roman Empire has transmitted. Though Rome has become many Romes nationally, these are still united ideally by her Justice, if not wholly by her Law.

V. Our theme, however, is at present the Roman Empire as the third stage of antiquity, which historic stage has its own process and in fact many of them. It lasts, as we look at it, some six centuries and a half from Augustus till the conquests of Mahomet.

How shall we periodize this considerable passage of time, which on the surface looks so chaotic, so disintegrating, so recalcitrant to anything like orderly succession? We are, however, to recognize that even disorder, revolution, separation has its necessary place in every complete synthesis not only of History but of Thought itself. First we put our finger upon the grand separative act of the total Period, the division of the Empire into East and West which culmi-

nates in the career of Constantine. So we have to regard the first sweep or stage of the Empire to last till the reign of Constantine and his permanent removal of the Capital from Rome to Constantinople. Moreover this was a time during which the Empire imparted its association to its numerous constituents, and indeed held together in order to perform this impartation completely. But after Constantine it no longer could hold together, having given away its center, its Capital, in fact itself. So Association becomes dissociated, which condition is emphasized by the irruption of the Barbarians, their settlement in Roman territory and their founding of numerous Kingdoms. The last great historic act of the Empire is the attempt of the Eastern part of it to restore the whole, and to rule the same from Byzantium, which work has its chief success in the long reign of Justinian whose great endeavor is to reassociate the dissociated Roman Empire, not from old Rome, but from the new imperial center.

Still employing that category (association) which expresses the basic fact of Roman History, and by which its events are to be ultimately ordered, in our opinion, we may formulate the three main stages of the Roman Empire as follows:

I. Association imparted.
II. Association dissociated.
III. Association restored.

I.

Association Imparted.

In the last Period of the Republic we saw Association extorted by the World from Rome; in the first Period of the Empire we shall see Association imparted to the World by Rome. Amid a great multitude of events this we deem the essential thread of imperial History at present: it shows Rome's voluntary, constitutional, peaceful grant of herself as associative to all of her dependencies. Such a grant, however, could not be accomplished by the Republic, being contrary to its whole spirit and organization; only the one Will, having become a settled principle in the Constitution, can by its own free act make itself the pivot for reversing the old political order.

How long will this Period last? Till Rome gives herself away completely, imparts herself as a whole, and not merely this and that right or privilege of hers. When she grants her Capital, of course through an imperial Will, to another City-State, then she has yielded up all that she has, truly her own selfhood. This is the founding of Constantinople as the seat of the Byzantine Empire through the Emperor Constantine (died 337 A. D.). Thus the present Period is a very long and full one, lasting three centuries and more. We behold the parent Rome beget

a son of the same nature (Homoousios), which political birth, we can also say, takes place in the fullness of time. Not without its historic counterpart does this period discuss and establish in the new religion the character and process of the Trinity.

This long Period embraces the History of the civilized world, has many divisions and sub-divisions, many historic processes great and small, of which here we can render no account. But through them all we can see the process of imperial Rome maintaining herself as central City-State, then in a deep struggle with the decentralizing forces, and finally as decentralized by Diocletian, who reaches till Constantine.

I. Rome, imparting herself more and more with the years, still keeps the Capital and maintains herself as the source and center of such impartation, at least till the time of Commodus (180–192 A. D.). She still preserves the Rim and makes some conquests across the border, which are repeatedly given up again. Externally she holds her own. But internally the process of self-impartation continues at an accelerated pace; she grants fuller municipal rights, and extends citizenship. Especially she imparts her military discipline not merely to the Provincials, who, becoming soldiers, thereby become Roman citizens, but also to Barbarians on the Rim. Thus her physical power she is giving away to

the outsiders, whom we shall soon see coming back to her as center from beyond the Rim.

In this Period we notice the following groups or families of emperors: (*a*) the four Cæsarians succeeding Augustus, conclude with Nero whose depravity has become proverbial. After a short break there follows (*b*) the Italic group or the family of Vespasian who was born a Sabine of Reate. (Three emperors from 69–96 A. D.). This imperial family concludes with Domitian, a wild beast of a ruler. After another short break follows (*c*) the Provincial group from Trajan to Commodus (98–180 A. D.). The line again ends in a monster.

First to be noticed is the movement in these three lines of emperors—Roman, Italic, Provincial. Imperial Rome is seen imparting her supreme authority to rulers more and more removed from the center. The one-man power which is to associate the World is now given away to the World, or perchance is taken by the World as her own. Vespasian and others, like Cæsar the original, marched from the border to Rome for his gift. Moreover we observe the fatal effect of Rome upon those who stay there and receive the Empire under some form of inheritance. The three have wound up in the three heirs—Nero, Domitian, and Commodus, each being the incarnation of Roman depravity and negation. It would seem that the true emperor has to come

from the Provinces directly or indirectly. The Provincial emperors—Trajan, Hadrian (both from Spain), Antoninus Pius (from Gaul), Marcus Aurelius (from Spain)—ruled over the Roman World at the height of its happiness. But the central city seems to be destroying its imperial progeny, undoing them morally, physically, and mentally. The Rim has always been the real trainer of the Roman Great Man, the true Emperor with his autocratic power—witness Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Cæsar during the Republic. Inheritance runs counter to the national evolution of the Great Man on the border; the imperial heir is corrupted and undone by the Roman City-State. Another inference may be hinted: the Provinces have indeed associated Rome when they furnish her rulers, and on her side she has largely imparted her associative power, when she is ruled by them.

The time of transition is indicated by the fact that Marcus Aurelius conjoined with himself Lucius Verus as emperor, who, however, died and Marcus then ruled alone. Upon which fact an old Historian makes the important comment: Tuncque primum Romanum imperium duos Augustos habere cœpit. The dualism has entered the imperial personality, and divided it into two emperors, though there seems to have been as yet no regular division of the Roman territory. Such is the premonitory symptom of the future separative work of Diocletian and Constantine.

Still another element of coming dissolution is shown by the attacks of the Northern Barbarians upon the Rim of the Roman Empire and their partial success. It took all the strength of Marcus Aurelius for years to stem the incoming Oceanic flood of peoples from the North, and he died in the harness at Vindobona (Vienna) in 180 A. D. In reality, however, even he did not keep them out but permitted large bodies of Teutons to settle inside the Rim as *colonati*, or military colonists who were now coming, not from Rome and Italy as in the Republic, but from the other direction, from the Barbarians who were to protect the Rim. This is now passing into possession of the Teutons.

II. After Marcus Aurelius, who still maintained, though with difficulty, the Roman imperial center as City-State, historic events show a decided trend toward decentralization and inner division. For a hundred years, say from the death of Marcus (180) till the time of Diocletian (284), the Roman Empire is a seething chaos, with a few lulls in its commotion. The old order shows every sign of going to pieces, yea to small pieces. In the time of Galienus, besides the regular Emperor, an old History sets down thirty separate claimants exercising imperial authority and called the thirty tyrants. Gibbon reduces this number to nineteen and he may be right. But nineteen shows sufficiently

the separative character of the time. In these hundred years a hundred emperors could be counted in the different parts of the Empire. Gibbon begins properly his *Decline and Fall* with Commodus, son of Marcus, who resigned his father's conquests on the Rim. In his time Roman Jurisprudence developed its greatest masters—Papinian, Ulpian, Paulus, and Modestinus, who with Gaius were designated as the highest legal authorities by several later Emperors. Law is indeed becoming the bond of the Roman State when this is politically dissolving. Religion is also establishing its covenant in the hearts of men through the Church and her Fathers, and thus stemming the outer dissolution.

A very significant event of the present epoch is the edict of the Emperor Caracalla who grants Roman citizenship to all freemen of the Empire, a seeming act of humanity done by one of the worst of rulers from one of the worst motives—to extort pay for his beneficence. Still it shows the Roman Empire imparting itself and its once exclusive rights to all freemen within its borders. But even here the exceptions must be noted to this universal equalization: the emperor, autocratic and above law and right, and the slaves not only rightless, but freedomless. The top and the bottom of the Roman State are not yet legalized, are in a sense lawless, and so will beget many collisions in and with law as universal.

Moreover connected with this inner disintegration of the Roman State is the outer disintegration of the Rim which once held the Empire together against the Barbarians. In the East the new Persian Monarchy makes inroads and seizes Roman territory. But the great inundation, breaking over the Rim takes place in the North, where the Teutons start incursions into the three Peninsulas—Spanish, Italian, and Greek. Especially the Teutonic Goths appear about the middle of the third century A. D., and open their career of war against the Roman Empire. We are not to forget that the Teutonic colonati already planted on the Rim by Marcus Aurelius were not the best protectors of Rome against their assailing kindred.

III. Diocletian (284 A. D.) possessed the strength to stay for a time the general dissolution of the Empire and to tide it over into a new period. He abandons Rome as Capital, which he seems to hate as the corrupter and destroyer of emperors. Wherever the imperial Ego abides, there the Capital can be; hence he makes two new Capitals, Milan in the West and Nicomedia in the East, both in old Provinces and not far from the border. So we behold the seat of the Empire dislocated, if not yet permanently located. Certainly Rome is being decentralized and transferred to the Provincials. Moreover Diocletian entirely gets rid of Senate and People; he gives

the last blow to old S. P. Q. R. even as form, and adopts the ceremonial of the Oriental autocracy. Yet he was of the humblest origin; his parents were said to have been slaves. He was born a Provincial from Dalmatia, and thus shows in person Rome in her supreme authority provincialized.

The tendency of the time is manifested by the fact that Diocletian divides the empire into four parts, each having its own Cæsar. He feels the separative instinct lurking in the World's History of his age. This may be given as the deepest reason why he persecuted Christianity which still furnished a bond of unity to the distracted time. It was slowly taking the place of the Roman State in associating the peoples of the Empire, and it even included the Barbarians in its bond.

Diocletian seemingly gave up his task as hopeless and retired to his palace in the country near Salona, Dalmatia, whose ruins still exist as a chief monument of later Roman architecture. Far from Rome and from his other Capitals he spent the last years of his life, leaving the Empire still divided between two rulers, Galerius and Constantius. The latter died at York in 306, leaving his son Constantine as successor, with whom a new Period of the Empire begins. In his case, too, the Rim and not the central City-State shows itself as Emperor-producing, and he re-enacts the typical deed of Julius Cæsar

in marching from the Provinces to Rome. In fact we have seen that repeatedly the Roman Emperor, in order to make himself a true Cæsar has to cross the Rubicon. Constantine, indeed, will not stay at Rome when he gets there, but will pass on to the Greeks whom he makes a nation, which they never were in their ancient autonomous condition. The Greek tongue, too, is re-established as the speech of an independent people, having been politically subject to the Latin for several centuries. In fact the East and the West, especially the Church, divide in the matter of language, into Greek and Latin. Moreover the ancient City-State with the founding of Constantinople enters upon its final phase of development. It has been going more and more toward universality; but the individual City-State making itself universal necessarily undoes itself as individual. Still this last Byzantine form of it will have a surprisingly long life, which indicates a deep-seated merit not generally acknowledged in the West.

II.

Association Dissociated.

So in a single phrase we seek to express the inner spirit of the present Period in which the one associative Rome divides within itself and becomes permanently two—Eastern and Western,

Greece and Rome, or new Rome and old Rome. The imperial City-State has imparted herself till she has given herself away completely and has become two imperial City-States. Already we have seen many approaches to this final separation, many striking prognostications of such an outcome. But with Constantine it gets to the realized historic fact, not to be fully undone again, though repeatedly attempted. The associative principle starting from the one center has reached the stage of inner dissociation and self-opposition in its process through the Empire.

But between these two City-States now called Rome and Constantinople, there is a very significant difference, derivable from the separative act itself. If Rome imparts herself completely, she must give her associative power, her unity to Constantinople. The result will be that the child, the new Rome, will inherit and preserve the ancient Roman unification, while the parent, the old Rome, will keep up its dissociative process, and will through it slowly fall to pieces internally and be knocked to pieces externally. The Roman City-State has become autocratic, yet preserves republican forms; Constantinople is the heir of the autocracy, pure and simple, quite without the old forms which have indeed become meaningless, and will now vanish to nothingness of themselves. So the new twain represents two opposite sides, the one putting

stress upon unity, the other upon separation. Rome and with her all Italy will become the field of disintegration, while the Greco-Roman East will preserve the Empire for more than a thousand years, in fact through the whole Medieval Period.

Still in this time of political division and dissociation, we must note three bonds of persistent association. (*a*) Religion has been keeping up and extending its work of uniting the souls of the Roman Empire in one deep abiding common faith, which is really the preservative power of the Roman world, though the Roman has persecuted it and sought to extirpate it. (*b*) The Roman Law is a spiritual uniter of men in a common justice which is to be administered to all equally, and has already become very fully organized through the Empire. (*c*) The third bond of Roman oneness must not be omitted, though it is getting divided: the Ego of the Emperor, which we have already noted as the third political element, and as that which the Emperor gave to the Roman City-State for its completion. We have also observed that through this imperial Ego the grand act of Roman impartation of rights began, which has made the people of the Roman World almost, yet not quite, equal before the law.

Another very weighty fact of this new Period is that associative Rome goes to Hellas, once the

very home of dissociation and separate communal autonomy. But Hellas has passed through more than four centuries and a half of Roman training, which we may suppose to start decisively with the taking of Corinth (146 B. C.), and with the making of Macedonian Greece into Roman Provinces. Thus the autonomous Greek City-State is associated from the outside till association has gotten inside and become a part of the new Greek character. Moreover the cluster of Greek communities is from the start put under an autocratic Ego, that of the pro-consular governor of the Province. For Rome did not try to associate the Hellenic cities and states separately, as she did those of Italy. Their autonomy was too old, fixed and ingrained; so we have seen Rome provincializing Greece from its first conquest. The result is that Greek spirit is politically transformed, and this insight into its new character must be deemed one of the supreme mental endowments of Constantine, who built his Empire upon it.

The Greek, or what has been more precisely called the Hellenistic world, including not only Hellas but Hellenized Asia, was in wealth, population and culture much superior to the West at this time. Art, science, literature, philosophy, and now theology had their distinctive home in the Greek East. And a new institution had there secretly evolved—the Church. Rome had

associated East and West in one political bond, but she had never conquered the Intellect of Greece, rather the latter had conquered her on her intellectual side. But the Greek Will had already begun to rise from its long lethargy. Several Roman Emperors, notably Hadrian, thought of transferring the Roman Capital to some Greek city. But the time was not yet ready, Rome's discipline of Greece for governing her Empire was not yet complete. But Constantine was the Emperor who had the foresight and the ability to restore the Greek State, of course on a new imperial basis, and to re-establish Greek institutions. Moreover he recognizes and confirms the new institution—the Greek Church, the only one then and the source of all others. Thus Constantine rebuilds the Greek institutional world, giving to it again independence and a new place in the World's History. The political Norm is still the Greek City-State, but filled now with the unity and associative power of Rome.

I. We are, therefore, to see Constantine as the pivot on which the Spirit of the Ages turns back from Rome to Greece, bringing to the latter her second national life and palingenesis. But we are to observe that his direction is from the extreme West. His father Constantius, one of the emperors succeeding Diocletian, died at York, on the farthest Rim of the

Roman Empire in 306 A. D. His successor was his son Constantine who starts on his career eastward, till in 323 he conquers his imperial polytheistic foe Licinius at Adrianople and then at Chalcedon, becoming the next year (324) the sole emperor of the Roman world. In these eighteen years he has seen it pass through no less than five civil wars, indicating clearly its tendency to dissolution. Can it be saved?

Such is the question that Constantine must have profoundly pondered, being forced thereto by the circumstances of the time. He saw that Italy was shorn of its human strength through war and devastation, slavery and social decline. He fought the Teutons and won battles over them, still it was clear to him that they would ultimately take the Provinces of the West. But when he reached Greece and the East, there dawned upon him the possibility of the new Roman Empire, with a new Capital. He had defeated Maxentius at Rome (312) and had gotten possession of it, still he saw that the day of Rome as the central City-State of the world was over. A new one must be built. But where and when? His genius and the World-Spirit will bring him to the time and place. Some eleven years later he wins the beforementioned battle with Licinius, and founds Constantinople as the new seat of Roman imperial unity. Moreover he adopts the resurrected Greek

spirit as his own and that of his Empire, since Roman spirit had largely vanished or was in a state of utter decay. The administration of the government he organized afresh, establishing a long line of graded officials. Undoubtedly he Orientalized to a certain extent, adjusting his rule to his Eastern people. Still he was therein like so many great Romans, who went East and became autocratic, from Sulla down. In the main, however, he adopted the new-born Hellenic will as the controlling energy of his rejuvenated City-State.

Parallel with this reconstructed State, arose under the creative hand of Constantine a new institution previously noticed—the Church. The imperial father of Constantine had already shown an unwillingness to persecute Christians. The son continued this secretly tolerant attitude, but he finally issued the famous edict of Milan (313) which openly granted them freedom of worship throughout his dominion. The conflict between him and Licinius was not merely a political battle, but also a religious,—the conflict between Heathendom and Christianity. He began the ecclesiastical councils with that of Arles in 314, seeking also to bring religion into unity. But the greatest of all councils was that of Nice (325 A. D.), called together by him for the purpose of formulating the fundamental doctrines of the Church, especially the doctrine of

the Trinity. Moreover he enforced the decrees of the religious authority by the civil power, and thus conjoined State with Church.

Over the horrors of Constantine's domestic life we shall draw a veil, separated as they must be from his world-historical career which ranks him among the Great Men of the past. It may be said of him that he heard the voice of the Age and made it actual in institutions. He was one of those supreme characters who mediated the World-Spirit with the Folk-Soul of the time. A mighty far-seeing institution-builder he was, having constructed a new State and a Church, both of which lasted long, and one of which yet lives.

II. Still the Empire as a whole continued its trend toward separation. Even Constantine divided it up among his sons, who soon added civil war to the outer conflicts with the borderers in the East and West, the Persians and the Teutons. The pivotal impact of Northern Peoples upon and across the Rim is that of the West Goths in 376, who are fleeing from the Huns. Afterward came also the East Goths. The Emperor Theodosius (379) succeeds in stemming for a time the progress of the barbarians, but he partitions the empire at his death (395) between his two sons, Honorius and Arcadius, which division is never again fully overcome. The East and the West, which had already divided Cæsar and Pompey, and afterwards Octavius and Antony during the

Republic, but which Octavius had, after the battle of Actium, skillfully welded into the one Empire, were now destined to wholly distinct, indeed opposite historic careers.

At once the West Goths invade Greece and then pass into Italy under Alarich who reaches Rome no less than three times. Athaulf, his successor, quits Italy, passes to Gaul, where he founds a kingdom. Attila, the Hun, is repelled from Gaul in 451, but lays waste Italy. Rome is repeatedly sacked by the barbarians. Finally Odoacer, king of several Teutonic tribes in Italy, is made king of the country (476) and the Roman Empire of the West is brought to an end. The last Emperor, Augustulus (Little Augustus) retires to private life.

Italy, Spain, Gaul and Britain, all the large Roman Provinces of the West, are now being baptized afresh in the primordial Ethnic Protoplasm, from which they once sprang. When civilization becomes effete, it is made to take this dip backward into its creative sources that it be born anew. Such was the function of the Macedonian and also the Roman to the degenerate City-States of ancient Hellas. Such is at present the function of the Teutonic peoples to the decayed Roman City-State of the West. We can say that the World-Spirit is performing the grand baptismal act of the ages, whereby a new European order is to emerge.

Thus the bi-section of the Greco-Roman world into East and West is not only accomplished, but the West is getting to be multifariously divided. The East, now the Byzantine Empire, on the contrary, maintains its unity within its own bounds, even if these are somewhat fluctuating. So we may say that in this time the world is separated into two opposite divisions: the One (East) versus the Many (West). It is a significant fact that Greece, once the great upholder of separation, has become the mainstay of unification in her transformed spirit, preserving and transmitting the old Roman association when it has gone to pieces in its original home.

III. Soon we observe the signs of the coming political change. The West Goths (Visigoths) move out of Italy to Gaul and Spain, where they found kingdoms, which are no longer City-States like those of Greece and Rome but the germ of a new kind of governmental form; we may call it the tribal or ethnic State. The ambition of the more enlightened Gothic kings was to restore Rome, and thus to preserve civilization. But this cannot be done and they see that it cannot. Very interesting is the confession of the successor of Alaric, who married Placidia, the daughter of Theodosius. He is reported to have said:

"There was a time when I aspired to make the ancient capital of the world my own capital, to

convert Romania into a Gothia, to call myself no longer Ataulphus but Cæsar Augustus; but I have discovered that the barbarians can never be subjected to civil institutions, my Goths can never be made Romans. Society shall not perish, I will restore the Roman Empire, protect it but not rule it." (Cited by Merivale, Hist. Rome).

In this period the Franks seize Northern Gaul, the Saxons invade England, the Vandals pass over to Africa, and the West Goths establish their Spanish dominion. But the greatest of all these Teutonic rulers is Theodoric the East Goth, who takes possession of Italy, which revives under his rule and reaches a high degree of prosperity. Through his effort the Roman and the barbarian begin to coalesce, the one furnishing law and civilization, the other a native uncorrupted strength of body and mind. But Theodoric was to experience that such a process of amalgamation had to be very slow, and he died seemingly in a kind of reaction against his own work and in a relapse to barbarism (526 A. D.) after a reign of nearly thirty-seven years from the time of his first invasion of Italy.

III.

Association Restored.

In the last Period of the Eastern Empire, there is a very decided and partially successful attempt to restore Roman Association and its

Mediterranean World, bringing the same again under the domination of the Byzantine City-State. Thus the latter seeks a return to the unity and territorial wholeness of the Roman Empire, employing not only conquest or rather re-conquest, but also the new associative bonds, Law and Religion. We behold a strong effort to stem the dissociation which has so powerfully set in with the invasions of the Northern barbarians and with the establishment of their numerous ethnic kingdoms in the lands of the old Empire. The West, ever separating into new tribal realms with the advent of new hordes from the North, must be once more subjected and conjoined with the East.

The culmination of this tendency toward the renewed unification of the Roman world takes place during the reign of Justinian (527–565 A. D.). A long period of authority is this, nearly forty years. Moreover Justinian was a middle-aged man when he ascended the throne in his own right, being some forty-five years old. His greatness consisted mainly in selecting and employing men greater than himself. He represented the last stage of what may be called antiquity in its final convulsive struggle to regain its former territory, and with the same a new lease of life. Really, however, its doom had been pronounced by the World-Spirit in more than one historic manifestation. In the West the incom-

ing ethnic State had decidedly surged to the front as the successor of the ancient City-State. In regard to the Orient it is enough to say at present that Mahomet was born four years after the death of Justinian. Still Byzantium is not going to perish, but will remain for many centuries the mean between the foregoing two extremes, which may be called European and Asiatic.

At present we shall give a very brief account of Justinian's movement toward the re-establishment and renewal of the vanishing antique world, which, however, he seeks to christianize and thus preserve.

I. The Emperor possessed a great military genius in Belisarius, who first went to Africa and conquered the kingdom of the Vandals which had been established there in Roman territory. Sicily is also conquered, and Belisarius passes over to Italy where he subdues the Gothic kingdom of Italy. Thence he goes East, but after being disgraced by his master he is again sent to Italy to quell a revolt of the Goths. Justinian also succeeded in getting back a part of Spain. But he never won the whole of the Roman West. Not long after his death the Lombards enter Italy and conquer the greater part of it, which thus passes again into the possession of a Teutonic tribe, and becomes a new ethnic State.

The main outer struggle of the whole reign of Justinian was to recover the West from the

Northern invaders and to stop its tendency toward a Polyarchy of Teutonic kingdoms. The Byzantine Empire was Henarchic, though essentially Greek, and seemed to be aware that a governmental form was arising quite opposite to its own. But its effort was unavailing, because directed against the historic movement of the time, really against the World-Spirit. To-day Europe is largely a Polyarchy of kingdoms which for the most part goes back to that old Teutonic partition and settlement which Byzantium tried to prevent, or at least to subordinate in the West. Still it held its own in the East, and thus Europe became politically separated into the two tendencies which we call Henarchic and Polyarchic, with a decided leaning toward the latter.

II. The religious bond which had been made actual in an institution, the Church, through Constantine chiefly, and enforced by law in the edicts of the later Emperors, was strongly emphasized by Justinian, though chiefly in an external way by persecution, by extermination of heresy, and by the suppression of heathen rites and even of heathen philosophy. The wars against the Goths and Vandals, who were Arian heretics, had at least a religious pretext; thus Christian had already begun to fight Christian for Christian reasons. Another famous negative act of Justinian was the suppression of the philosophic Schools of Athens (529 A. D.), which

claimed an uninterrupted succession of philosophers from Plato. Proclus, the last great Neo-Platonic Scholarch, had died some forty-two years before Justinian began his reign, and really brought to a conclusion the movement not only of his own school but that of the whole ancient Philosophy, chiefly by his doctrine of the Fundamental Triad.

But by all means the greatest positive religious act of Justinian was his erection of the world-cathedral known as the church of St. Sophia. It has been the most influential edifice of Christendom, if we estimate its influence by the number of religious structures which have taken it as a copy. Not alone Christians but other religions, notably the Mahommedan, have patterned their places of worship after it as the supreme model of their God's habitation. Its architectonic form has rayed out creatively from its center to India in the East, and to Spain in the West. The Greek again has created an architectural work of art which strikes the key-note of universality like the Parthenon. Very different races and religions have not failed to adopt each and both as the most fitting institutional home of their deity. We may well deem them the God's two archetypal palaces, heathen and christian, and the curious fact is that they both bear the same dedication and superscription to Divine Wisdom (to Pallas, the old Greek Heathen Goddess of

Wisdom, and to Hagia Sophia, the Christian Greek's Holy Wisdom). Thus the building of St. Sophia must be deemed a great unireligious act, unifying in a typical edifice not only Christianity, but other religions, and even races. No Gothic structure has ever had any such far-extending power over diverse peoples and faiths. It may be added, however, that St. Sophia is seemingly the only work of Byzantine art which has made such a mighty appeal to the feeling of universal religion both in European and Asiatic souls. Also the architect of St. Sophia should not be forgotten, though little is known of him except his name—Anthemius of Tralles. Let it be placed alongside of that of Ictinus, the architect of Parthenon.

III. The greatest unitary act of Justinian, however, lay not in the sphere of Religion but of Jurisprudence. The vast and ever-increasing diversity of Roman Law he brought together in three all-embracing works called the Code, the Pandects and the Institutes. In general, the associative principle of Rome was expressed in her Law, which became a chief means of uniting and holding together her empire. The Republic, as already set forth, associated its dependencies by different ties to the central City-State, which were expressed in treaties, and in other legal instruments. Thus arose an enormous diversity of association formulated in a corresponding multi-

plicity of laws—a vast polynomy inside the one law-making power (or mononomy). But the empire from the start sought to do away with this excessive and confusing legal multiplicity, and to simplify the Law. Hence the many attempts at codification—Julius Cæsar planned it already. Justinian consummated it for the future and thus brought about uniformity as well as equality of rights. Rome now becomes internally mononomous, having been externally so from the Republic.

With this reformation of Jurisprudence by Justinian, the evolution of the Law in antiquity reaches its culmination. The State expresses its ultimate Will as command in the Law; hence political History must concern itself with the Law as the inmost expression of the State, the utterance of its very soul. We have already often designated the Greek political institution by its legal character as autonomous. Rome as Republic overcomes this autonomous diversity of City-States, but remains internally polynomous, though externally she is the one lawgiver or mononomous. The tendency of the Empire is to get rid of this inner diversity of laws (polynomy) with their conflicts—which work is at last accomplished by Justinian. We are justified in saying that this is the final great act of the Empire and indeed of the ancient world, which not long after Justinian's death was

brought to an end by a new inbreaking order. The City-State of antiquity has, therefore, gone through its three great legal stages—autonomy, polynomy, and mononomy as complete.

Constantine saw that the Empire was internally divided into East and West. The city Rome in his time still leaned to Heathendom and to the old order with its empty forms. So he concluded that the easier task was to make a new central Capital than to reconstruct the old one. Also he saw that Italy with the West was dissolving back into its original tribal elements, which republican Rome had once conquered and associated. So he established the Byzantine or Eastern unity against the Western separation. But Justinian deemed himself able to overcome this Western separation and to restore the Roman Henarchy. Politically his effort was in vain, as it ran counter to the World-Spirit, which is bringing forth, as the next great stage of Universal History, the inner division of the Mediterranean World, With Justinian the historical movement of antiquity practically closes; Hellas, Rome, Empire, with the latter's return to Hellas have rounded themselves out into one vast Period, which manifests completeness within itself, as well as the transition into the following co-ordinate Period, the Medieval.

The Middle Ages.

What can we grasp and set down as the definite Medieval act? This must not only end antiquity, but show itself as the deepest pervasive principle of the coming new Period. In our judgment the blow struck by Mahomet and his successors is what concludes the antique time and opens what is generally called the Medieval world, which lies in its main outline between the two great assaults of the Mahomedans of West-Asia upon the Christians of Europe. The Period-making conflict of the Middle Ages was, accordingly, that between two world-religions, each seeking to have supremacy over the Roman Empire. To this religious conflict must be added a substrate in some respects the deepest of all, namely race. The Asiatic Semite, long dominated by the European Aryan, rises and asserts himself not only religiously but also politically, founding a new religion and a new empire to supplant the Christian and the Roman.

The outcome is a separation of the ancient tri-continental Mediterranean World, which makes the entire following Period separative as regards its essential character, in spite of the desperate attempts to overcome this separation. There is no doubt that the great Saracenic conquerors

sought to unite Europe with their Oriental dominion. From the other side the Crusaders poured over the border into Asia with the purpose of reducing the East again to the West. This struggle between the sides—Christian with Mahomedan, European, with Oriental, Aryan with Semite and later with the Turanian Turk—is what lies always in the background of the History of Europe during the Middle Ages. The irregular ellipse of territories around the Midland Sea is now split in twain, with a Northern (European) half and a Southern (Oriental) half whose multifarious interaction in war and peace gives the historic key-note for quite a thousand years.

We saw the great historical purpose of Justinian to be a new unification of the antique world, which showed in his time so many signs of separation and dissolution. He sought to restore, as far as he could, the outer territorial integrity of the Roman Empire. One religion he would enforce, also one law, yea, one tongue to a degree. His impulse we call Henarchic, trying to counteract the decided Polyarchic tendency of the age. And unconsciously under these various unities lay the most hidden, yet the most coercive unity of them all—that of race. The dominant Greco-Roman world was Aryan, and this the policy of Justinian would keep uppermost. Moreover the Teutons and the largest part of the barbarians of

Europe were of Aryan blood. Hence amid all these divisions, political, religious, linguistic, the European peoples remained uniracial, to be sure unconsciously so. But the unconscious principle is often the most influential one, because the most elusive. In fact the ultimate ground of the movement of nations in the World's History is the primordial difference among mankind called race.

Now it is this difference (among others) which ushers in the world-historical Period known as the Middle Ages. The racial separation of the contending sides appears dominantly in the World's History for the first time. To be sure, the early conflict of Greek with Phœnician, and the later conflict of Rome with Carthage, had doubtless a substrate of race. The Semite in both cases was suppressed; but now he rises again with a fresh unlimited energy, and conquers his Aryan master in the Orient. Moreover he brings with his supremacy a new Semitic religion, upon which the chief stress is placed openly, though in and through this religion the secret instinct of race is mightily lurking and working.

If we go back a thousand years, to the beginning of European History, we find the Greeks in conflict with another Oriental people, the old Persians. But these were Aryans, as well as the Greeks, so that the conflict lay inside of the one race, which was thus separating within itself into

Orient and Occident, or into Europe and Asia. The Persian indeed had subjected the Phœnicians and other Semitic peoples, and was hurling them against Hellas in that old Greco-Persian War, which we have already portrayed as the world-historical dawn. It is to be noted that the separation involved in man's consciousness of History had its origin within the same race, and not in the clash between two different races.

Accordingly the Semite, long subjected by the Aryan, emerges from his primal pre-historic subsidence, and participates as an independent factor in the World's History, which is no longer uniracial as in antiquity, but bi-racial—its character during the whole medieval time. And this bisection runs through religion, family, state, language, through all spiritual products as well as through the Mediterranean territory, indeed we might say through the Mediterranean Sea. That unilegal, unireligious, unipolitical, as well as dominantly uniracial empire of Justinian is cleft along its whole diameter spatially and spiritually, becoming two Mediterranean empires, which clash both internally and externally at about every point. Rome and Byzantium had indeed separated, but the present separation cuts far deeper, truly quite to the bottom.

Hence come the reason and the necessity of considering the Middle Ages to be the separative stage of European History as a whole. This

stage is in the order of the inner psychical movement of events, being the second of the total sweep. The one antique Mediterranean world cracks open and becomes two fighting halves for the next millennial stretch of time. Each half, Mahommedan and Christian, has its own inner history which is also deeply separative in the main. The Saracenic World, as well as the European, will show the Polyarchic tendency in spite of the struggles to the contrary. Many a caliphalate will rise on the one side, many a kingdom on the other. Political division dominates both. Still in both the religious bond will hold together the ever-separating States. Undoubtedly we have to regard this separative condition as a step of progress toward the supreme end of History, though it has its negative, forbidding aspect. The Middle Ages have been often called the Dark Ages. Still we are to see also the positive element which is evolving in and through their obscuration. The inner tie deepest in the souls of men, that of religion, which classic antiquity had largely eliminated from its culture, is restored, developed and organized. And the City-State is passing over into the far larger and more universal Nation-State, even through the barbarious Ethnic State. On each side of the Mediterranean the old-world civilization is taking a dip into the primordial protoplasm of peoples, that the new-world civilization may arise.

Politically the Medieval Period brings a restoration of nationality, to which the ancient City-State was necessarily hostile, with its narrow intra-mural exclusiveness. Not one of the old famous City-States of Greece was ever able to broaden itself out so as to embrace the Greek nation. The Roman Republic endured no other associative bond but its own. In Byzantium the new-born Greek City-State succeeded in being national, though from the outside and not of its own inner evolution. Really the Teutonic tribes are restoring nationality to the nations, and slowly uniting it with civilization which anciently was its victorious foe. Thus the Medieval Period is truly middle and mediatorial, mediating the old civilized City-State with new civilized Nation-State.

Nor are we to forget the Mahommedan half of the Medieval world, where not only nationality but race is restored to independence after centuries of submergence. The Semitic peoples under the lead of the Arabians not only throw off the Aryan yoke of Europe, but march against it, and win the Spanish peninsula, which of old had a considerable strain of Semitic civilization through the Phœnicians and Carthaginians. In both halves, the Oriental and European, we see religion and nationality rising to the surface from their long subordination, and becoming the regnant forces of the World's History. Each half

indeed struggles long and desperately for supremacy over the other, whence springs the deepest Medieval conflict, which more or less remotely determines the inner conflicts of both.

It is characteristic of these Middle Ages that there is a middle realm lying between and keeping separated the two contestants, Europe and the Orient. This mean between the two extremes, half-European and half-Oriental, is the Byzantine Empire, which lasts during the entire Medieval time. Both sides surge into it and across it for centuries, till at last the Turk seizes it and has held it till the present. It represents the inner borderland between the two colliding halves of the Mediterranean World, wherein we see that the old Roman Rim has become internal on the side toward the Orient. When this Medieval landmark is swept away, a new Period is dawning in which Europe and Asia are brought face to face, without the Byzantine intermediary.

Byzantium is, therefore, the visible division between Orient and Europe, or between the Christian and the Mahommedan—the territorial belt which both indicates as well as keeps apart the warring twain. And within itself division also seemed ever present and at work. It sought to retain the old City-State against the rise of the political norm of the Nation. It was national too, but the one Greek Nation was to be the ruler over other Nations. Europe let it perish, since

it was opposed to the advancing European Polyarchy, which in the modern time is to have full sweep, as at present. When the religious spirit of the Middle Ages was waning, and the political tendency was getting paramount, the Turk was suffered by Christendom to take Christian Constantinople in 1453, the most impressive sign of a new historic Period.

The Modern Time.

Of prime importance in organizing European History is the fact that from West-Asia have come three grand assaults upon Europe, which in its fundamental historic movement has been determined by them. The first of these Oriental assaults was the Persian, already designated as the opening act of History. The second was the Arabian, which starts the Medieval Period. The third was the Turkish, whose impact upon the Byzantine empire culminated in the taking of Constantinople, and was intimately connected with the rise of the Modern Period, which is still going on. Moreover a new race enters Europe with a strong offensive power, seemingly allied, though in a remote way, to some of Europe's oldost pre-Aryan stocks. If this be so, a Turanian people in the Turkish Tartar has come again to the West to claim its ancient heritage from the usurping Aryan immigrants.

These old racial impulses are indeed very deep, but also very dark, lying in the night of a far-off pre-historic past. But in the clear light of His tory we can see that Europe has been periodized by the foregoing West-Asiatic movements, all of which are mighty and prolongod efforts on the part of the Orient to seize the European boon, whatever that may be. There would seem to be

in the Oriental soul a primordial instinct which drives it to overcome, externally as well as internally, that deepest separation of it into Orient and Occident, and to recover the offshoot of itself which long since migrated westward. For Europe is a derived world, and derived from the East (see preceding pp. 30–36). The Occidental consciousness of self and its worth, one of whose births is our recorded World's History, is what the Orient will subordinate, if not blot out, as the very negation of itself, or at least as its deepest and most persistent limitation.

Accordingly we are fully to conceive this fundamental fact of European History: three mighty blows directed at different times from the Orient at the West by its three races, Aryan (Persian), Semitic (Arabian), and Turk (Turanian), have knocked (so to speak) Europe into its three main historic Periods, causing such a profound reaction and resurgence against Oriental domination, that European History takes a new turn in the movement toward its end. In other words, Ancient, Medieval, and Modern History gets its division from this deepest of all struggles, which lies between races, religions and continents (see preceding pp. 118–122). It is manifest that there can be no complete History of Europe taken by itself, without its Period-making conflicts with West-Asia from the historic beginning till now.

It should be observed that the Turk has won what the old Persian sought some 2,000 years before him, namely Hellas. The Arabian also strove to reach the Hellenic gift, but did not succeed. His chief energy went around the Southern Mediterranean, and entered Western Europe by way of Spain, where he stayed during the Medieval time, going out as the Turk came in. The whole Greek Peninsula was ruled by the Oriental at last; what Xerxes lost, Mohammed the II gained. The line of the Adriatic was won substantially and held by the Ottomans, though they were repulsed from Vienna in 1683. From that limit they have slowly receded till at present they stay in Europe not of their might but through the mutual jealousies of the other European Nations.

Politically Greece (as Byzantine) was quite lost, but culturally there was a great revival of her power. Western Europe went back to ancient Hellas spiritually, restoring the influence of her art, literature, philosophy, science. This was the main trend of what is known as the Renaissance, or New Birth of Antiquity in the spirit of the time. So it becomes manifest that this third or Modern Period is a return to the first or Hellenic Period, and thus completes the cycle of European culture. A great rejuvenation it was of an old civilization, which baptized itself afresh in the youth of Hellas. The renewal of

Greek and Latin studies has lasted, remaining a part of the training of every educated individual to-day.

Deeply connected with this cultural movement, was a religious revival, which went back to the sources of Christianity in the Bible, and studied them in a new light. The Reformation hints by its name that the Church is to be made over through a restoration of its pristine purity and simplicity. The result was a great separation which produced in the West two ecclesiastical divisions, Catholic and Protestant. During the Medieval Period there had also been two Churches—Eastern and Western, or Greek and Latin. But the Greek Church has lost its independence under the hand of the Turk. This second separation is Northern and Southern, in the main Latin and Teutonic. The latter splits up still further according to nationality, so that in the North there is a group of national churches, which are united with the State.

But in History the main fact of the Renaissance is the political return to Greek antiquity. Europe becomes a cluster or society of independent, autonomous States, similar to what we once saw in Hellas. Both the old Greek and the modern European have evolved Polyarchies, in which the separative character of Europe strikingly manifests itself. At the same time we are to note the great difference in kind between these

two sets of States. Already it has been observed that antiquity as a whole suppressed nationality; the old civilized City-State was more or less antagonistic to the Nation, which found its primal birth and growth anciently among uncivilized peoples, till it swept down upon and divided the Roman Empire. The last great historic act of the Greco-Roman world was the attempt to restore the City-State to imperial power, to bring back political antiquity, or at least Rome. This was the life-long endeavor of Justinian, but it could be only temporarily successful.

The modern political unit of Europe is, accordingly, the Nation-State, in which we behold the governmental result of the Middle Ages. The latter Period elaborated historically the barbarous ethnic State, and made it civilized, and so prepared it to go back to antiquity for the purpose of harmoniously appropriating the same. That indeed is the essence of the grand Return to the antique beginning called the Renaissance (better Renascence). The medieval training was largely the school of the barbarous Teutons, who were to get civilized and christianized from the Mediterranean world, and in turn were to impart to the old civilization the new nationality. The sweep of Europe back to Greece and Rome indicates that the Medieval dualism between the barbarous and the civilized is substantially overcome. Modernity and antiquity shake hands

across the Middle Ages, whose main function is to mediate the two sides.

The History of Europe in the Modern Period is, therefore, that of a Polyarchy of Nation-States. There is also a tendency in these, or in the largest, to go back to the imperial principle of Rome. Significant is the fact that so many of the European Nation-States have called themselves Empires. England quite recently has taken this title. Imperialism has become a political slogan of the time, even in America. Europe has overflowed its bounds, and is becoming extra-European. But it encounters nations, tribes, communities beyond its Rim: what shall be done with them? Subordinate them to the central government in some way, or imperialize them. The newly discovered countries abroad have been thus appropriated during the modern time, and Europe has largely become a Polyarchy of imperial Nation-States each being a new sort of old Rome.

The deepest and most urgent political problem of Europe to-day is evidently the Polyarchic—the problem of many independent autonomous States within a limited territory, and it may be added within a common consciousness, which can well be deemed European. For Europe as a whole in the Modern Period has shown this common political consciousness, that of national autonomy. Each Nation-State, as it has been

transmitted by ages, is to make its own laws and to be self-administered wholly. At the same time there has been the counter tendency to violate the aforesaid autonomy of each and all. The larger Nation-States and the largest one have often been inclined to swallow the smaller members of the Polyarchy. The result is that the History of Modern Europe is full of leagues, alliances, combinations of the weaker against the stronger. An ever-present national jealousy is one of the troubles sprung of the Polyarchy, and also a continual fear of the greater on part of the lesser. Hence we behold every European Nation-State standing on guard against its neighbor, armed to the teeth. Twelve millions of men, as the statement runs, are required to keep the peace in a time of profound peace. The most pronounced manifestation of the Polyarchic malady is the European armament, which devours much of the best brain and muscle, as well as the treasures of the European Nation-State. How can it ever compete permanently with a political system which has banned the people-consuming monster of the Polyarchy? This fact the best men of Europe fully recognize, and they seek to ameliorate their condition by one makeshift or other.

It is of historic interest at present to see that the European Polyarchy of Nation-States has developed on certain sides similar troubles to

that of the old Greek Polyarchy of City-States, of which an account has been given on the preceding pages. Autonomy in the one case as in the other reveals a like limitation—the jealousies and the fears of a group of individual States fenced in by a common territorial boundary. Hegemony of the one over the many also appears, with the resultant conflicts against it by the others. No associative Rome has yet arisen inside of Modern Europe, even if some great leaders of the past have attempted the task, but have failed in the end. The Empire as such can hardly unite the Nation-States, each of which shows the bent to be imperial in itself. From this point of view Europe is a cluster of Romes, or, as already remarked, of imperial Nation-States.

Such, then, is the present aspect of the European Polyarchy, as the historic evolution of its past. What about the future? That is notoriously uncertain but is sure to unfold. So much, however, we may dare speak out: Europe, which has hitherto been for us the arena of the World's History in conjunction with West-Asia, must more and more reveal itself to be but a part—surely a very important one—of the total historic process. In contrast with the Orient generally, it has given birth to History as recorded and continuous, and also has developed it through one of its great stages or æons—the

separative stage of the World's History, which separative character we have seen running through both ancient and modern times in what we have so often called the Polyarchy. This is the salient fact of both the old Greek City-State and the modern Nation-State of Europe, as well as of the Middle Ages, which, moreover, are separative on their own account, that is, as the subordinate second stage of the total second stage of History. Or, in one more repetition, Europe, whose middle is the Medieval Period, is itself the middle of the entire world-historical movement, lying between Orient and Occident.

It is generally accepted that the last form of State, which has unfolded through the ages, shows best what lay in the germ of the earliest State. History, recording essentially political events, obtains a new meaning from every governmental evolution. The present cannot help throwing its illumination back upon the past, which is always coming toward and into it and nothing else. The Occident, therefore, has or will have the Tribunal of the World's History, and will render judgment. This will necessarily be divergent from the Asiatic or the European view. Already we have noted that America has a different political norm from the Eastern continent; we have called it the State-producing State, which no longer leaves to haphazard migration or agglomeration the deepest and most

important of all political functions, the genesis of States in this process of the World's History.

Evidently a great change is taking place in the historic field, both outer and inner, both spacial and spiritual. It has been said that quite up to the present age Europe has been the arena of the World's History, along with her impinging energizer, West Asia. But at present all the Orient is entering the world-historical process, and also the Occident. The conception and the domain of this process are in a deep, far-reaching transition, which has already dethroned the historic autocracy of Europe, even if she still is first among equals. The World's History can no longer be simply European History, which has become one stage, doubtless the most important as yet, of the circumterrene belt of the globe's distances and deeds. True to its name the World's History is getting around the World, and ridding itself of its contradiction which it could not help showing as long as it was confined to Europe and adjacent lands. The time is coming when no single State, no single Continent by itself can be world-historical, for it is not the World. The total process of History must be all-inclusive.

Already it has been noticed that in Europe the particular city or nation has had to be at a given time the supporter and vindicator of the world-historical idea, of that which we have called the

World-Spirit. Or the matter may be put in this way: what is particular has had to bear and to be the universal—wherein lies verily a mighty inadequacy and contradiction. The result is that the European World-Spirit has shown a dominantly negative character, destroying first other States and then its own State. Thus a line of rising and falling States runs through its History till the present. The problem presses: Cannot this destructive phase of the World's History be made constructive? How can the World-Spirit be gotten inside the process, and become no longer negative? Certainly not by the European political system, not by the Polyarchy of City-States or of Nation-States, which is really the source of the trouble. And it would seem that Europe cannot within itself cure its own malady. Like ancient Greece again, the remedy must come from the outside. But how? By force, which was the old way of History, or by the voluntary adoption of some kind of federative principle? The Hague Tribunal of the present year (1907) has at least shown Europe's struggles at her hitherto Sisyphean labor. She cannot give up her Polyarchy, and so the stone rolls down hill again, after prodigious effort in heaving it topward. No Macedon, no Rome appears in the horizon for compelling her to associate, and she seems unable and in fact unwilling to associate herself. Her outer peace depends not on the

whole, but on a part, yea a particle perchance, while her inner peace is seamed with national suspicion, anxiety, and untold outlay of mind, muscle, and treasure. Such is in brief the Polyarchic malady of present Europe, according to the declarations of her best spirits, yet she finds it impossible to rise out of her Polyarchic consciousness. As little could the old Greek City-State throw off its fixed idea of urban autonomy, as can the modern European Nation-State that of national autonomy. And yet it is getting more and more evident that the decree of the World-Spirit has been delivered against the political system of Europe, having reduced it from the whole to a part or stage of Universal History.

The outlook is that just this is what will bring relief. The Polyarchy of Nation-States can exist as one constituent of the threefold movement of the World's History, but no longer as the entirety thereof. It can furnish the element of separation, of particularity, but not the grand totality, of whose process it must function as a part or member. Thus it will remain indefinitely as the second stage of the whole world-historical Psychosis, as unfolded up to date. The particular State, or the group of particular States called the Polyarchy, will become an inherent component of the World-Spirit whose supreme end is the universal State, and whose conflict with the particular State, of which European History has

been full, will be moderated if not altogether mediated. The Polyarchy of Nation-States will get rid of its own inner trouble when it comes to be that which it truly is—a part and not the whole. We have already noted the negative character of the World-Spirit toward the European nation even when the latter was its chosen upholder. Really it was seeking, though by war and violence, to put Europe into her historic place, or to make her put herself into her historic place. And this World-Spirit, finding its complete unfettered process more and more within the totality of History, will become less and less destructive of the particular State, but rather preservative of the same as an essential element of its own living and working entirety. As already indicated the European Polyarchy belongs to the whole but is not the whole—and just that will probably be its final redemption.

In like manner the Orient must undergo a great political transformation, and become a part or stage of the world-historical process. Hitherto it has been largely outside of the World's History except when it collided with Europe and especially with Greece, which at once turned upon it an historic light, often not very large or luminous, still a light. The rapidity with which the Orient is taking up the political and economic institutions of the West is almost dizzying even to a Westerner. We have already introduced

our readers to the Persian Empire opening History by its collision with the Greco-European world some five hundred years before Christ. That Empire exists to-day largely in its pristine form of an Oriental despotism governed by an autocrat and his satraps, as we know it from Herodotus and other Greek writers. But lo! a sudden change! The preceding sentence in substancce had been written down hardly more than a year ago, when we read in the newspapers that a revolution had broken out in Teheran, that the Shah had granted a Constitution (1906) and that the Majlis (Parliament) had actually assembled and had begun to legislate. Thus the old absolutism of Asia is becoming constitutionalized according to the English pattern. China also is to have a representative government after a preparatory term of years. And India is clamoring for home rule, if not for independence. The phenomenal deed of Japan has roused the cry: Asia for the Asiatics. A corresponding shout has been reported even from Africa. The Orient is assimilating itself to the Occident politically and economically, but not religiously. The great chasm in secular institutions between Asia and Europe is being rapidly filled, as if preparatory to some grand act of association. The State, which is the soul of History, is getting alike the world over, getting ready, we may think, to become one State, which can be, when

fully actualized, only the State universal. This is the final aim and end of the movement of the World's History, as has been often declared in the preceding pages. Its triple process—Oriental European, Occidental—has definitely unfolded and started, with its three stages no longer merely successive in time, but synchronous and ever present. Still the Orient will remain itself, as well as each of the other two factors, in fulfilling its world-historical destiny.

The New Psychology.

I. Psychology and the Psychosis.

The following are some of the distinctive features of this work on Psychology:

It has the Psychosis, which is a new thread woven through the entire science, and to a certain extent, transforming the same.

Its procedure is that of mental evolution from beginning to end, thus bringing out strongly the connecting links of this science.

It treats very fully the subject of Symbolism, most important to educators and especially to kindergartners.

The leading activity of mind, Thought—is not expelled from the science, but has a full exposition.

It is not a physiological psychology, though the latter receives its due recognition in its proper field.

II. The Will and its World.

This book takes up the Will and develops it, in line with preceding work. It has two parts. Part First gives a very full account of the Will as psychical. Part Second treats of the Moral Will and is a treatise on the Psychology of Ethics. pp. 575.

III. Social Institutions.

This work, which is just published, gives a psychological treatment of human Institutions. pp. 615.

IV. The State.

A psychological treatment of the State based upon the Constitution of the United States. pp. 565.

V. Ancient European Philosophy.

The History of Philosophy as a development of Psychology. pp. 725.

VI. Modern European Philosophy.

To be published in Spring of 1904.

All these works have been reduced from $2.00 to $1.50 (not net).

(OVER.)

Keep this Catalogue for Reference.

Note reduction in price.

WORKS BY DENTON J. SNIDER

PUBLISHED BY

SIGMA PUBLISHING COMPANY,

210 PINE STREET, ST. LOUIS, MO.

I. Commentary on the Literary Bibles, in 9 vols.

1. Shakespeare's Dramas, 3 vols.
   - Tragedies (new edition), . . $1.50
   - Comedies (new edition), . . 1.50
   - Histories (new edition), . . 1.50
2. Goethe's Faust.
   - First Part (new edition), . . 1.50
   - Second Part (new edition), . 1.50
3. Homer's Iliad (new edition), . 1.50
   - " Odyssey, . . . 1.50
4. Dante's Inferno, ... 1.50
   - " Purgatory and Paradise, 1.50

II. Psychology.

1. Psychology and the Psychosis, . 1.50
2. The Will and its World, . . 1.50
3. Social Institutions, . . . 1.50
4. The State, ... 1.50
5. Ancient European Philosophy, . 1.50
6. Modern European Philosophy, . 1.50

III. Kindergarden.

1. Commentary on Froebel's Mother Play-Songs, ... 1.25
2. The Psychology of Froebel's Play-Gifts, ... 1.25
3. The Life of Frederick Froebel, . 1.25

IV. Poems — in 5 vols.

1. Homer in Chios, ... 1.00
2. Delphic Days, ... 1.00
3. Agamemnon's Daughter, . . 1.00
4. Prorsus Retrorsus, . . . 1.00
5. Johnny Appleseed's Rhymes, . 1.25

V. Miscellaneous.

1. A Walk in Hellas, . . . 1.25
2. The Freeburgers (a novel), . 1.25
3. World's Fair Studies, . . . 1.25

For sale by A. C. M'Clurg & Co., Booksellers, Chicago, Ills., to whom the trade is referred.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU